



For copies, apply to

THE AUTHOR or KRISHNAN, M.A., M.Sc.,
12, North Madavilagam,
Thiruvaiyaru P. O., South India.

Price Rs. 12·50.

PREFACE

This volume contains six *āhnikas* and ends with the second *adhyāya* of *Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The size was cut down on account of unforeseen circumstances. Till now nearly 1500 pages have been printed. The remaining manuscript matter may come to another 2000 pages. I wish it too finds the light of day.

I am grateful to the Sahitya Akademi for financial assistance in the publication of this volume. My heartfelt thanks are due to the Government of India, Kāñci Kamakoti Mutt, Kumbaconam, Annamalai University and University of Travancore for their encouragement. May Mother Śivakāmasundarī & Lord Naṭarāja enable the remaining volumes to be published.

Thiruvaiyaru,
15—11—1962.

P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI.

CONTENTS

TWENTY-THIRD ĀHNIKA

TWENTY-FOURTH ĀHNIKA

TWENTY-FIFTH ĀHNIKA

TWENTY-SIXTH ĀHNIKA

LECTURES ON PATAÑJALI'S MAHĀBHĀṢYA

Volume VI

Āhnika — Twentythree

(*Second adhyāya, second pāda, second āhnika*)

अनेकमन्यपदार्थे (2, 2, 24)

There are *seven* topics here: 1–3. The need for the words *pada, anya* and *anēka* in the *sūtra* (4). The appropriateness or otherwise of using a word denoting individuality after a *bahuvrīhi* as in *Citraguḥ Dēvadattaḥ;* (5) The need for the *pariganaṇa* of *Bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇānām* etc.; 6–7. The nature of the *samāsa* in *kimsabrahmacārī* and *arddha-tṛtīyā*.

I

पदग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is *pada* read?

इह अनेकमन्यार्थे इति इयत्युच्यमाने वाक्यार्थेऽपि बहुव्रीहिः स्यात् - यथा मे माता तथा मे पिता, सुस्नातं भो इति

If *anēkam anyārthē* alone is here read, the sentence *yathā mē mātā tathā mē pitā* tco which suggests the meaning *susnātam* may compound into *bahuvrīhi*.

NOTE:—The sentence *yathā...pitā* suggests the needlessness of a bath on account of his high pedigree in answer to the injunction *snāhi*.

पदग्रहणे पुनः क्रियमाणे न दोषो भवति

But if *pada* is read, there will be no difficulty.

II

अथ अन्यग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is then *anya* read?

अनेकं पदार्थे इति इयत्युच्यमाने स्वपदार्थेऽपि बहुव्रीहिः स्यात् - राजपुरुषः, तक्षपुरुष इति ।

If, *anēkam padārthē* alone is read, the compound expressing the meaning of the component parts like *rājapuruṣaḥ* and *takṣapuruṣaḥ* may be considered *bahuvrīhi*.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । तत्पुरुषः स्वपदार्थे बाधको भविष्यति ।

This is not the benefit. *Tatpuruṣa* which expresses the meaning of component parts may veto it.

भवेदेकसंज्ञाधिकारे सिद्धम् । परङ्कार्यत्वे न सिध्यति । आरम्भसामर्थ्याच्च तत्पुरुषः, परङ्कार्यत्वाच्च बहुव्रीहिः प्राप्नोति ।

It is secured on adhering to the doctrine that there is only one *saṁjñā* before the *sūtra Kaḍārāḥ* ... ; but it will not do if *Prāk kaḍārāt param kāryam* is acceded to. It may be taken as *tatpuruṣa* on the strength of its being at the commencement and *bahuvrīhi*, since it, being *para*, may operate.

परङ्कार्यत्वे च न दोषः । शेष इति वर्तते । अशेषत्वान्न भविष्यति

There is no harm even if *paraṅkāryatva* is acceded to. There is *anuvṛtti* for *śēṣa*. *Rājapuruṣa*, being away from the range of *śēṣa*, cannot be taken as *bahuvrīhi*.

शेषवचने उक्तम्

It was said with reference to the reading of *śēṣa*.

किमुक्तम्? What was said?

तत्र शेषवचनाद्दोषः सङ्ख्यासमानाधिकरणनञ्समासेषु बहुव्रीहिप्रतिषेध इति

The reading of *śēṣa* will lead to *bahuvrīhi-pratiṣēdha* with reference to *saṅkhyāsamāsa, samānādhikaraṇasamāsa* and *nañ-samāsa*.[1]

अथैकसंज्ञाधिकारे नार्थोऽन्यग्रहणेन ?

Is not, then, *anya* needed in *ēkasaṁjñādhikārapakṣa* ?

एकसंज्ञाधिकारे च कर्तव्यम् । अक्रियमाणे ह्यन्यग्रहणे यथैव तत्पुरुषः स्वपदार्थे बहुव्रीहिं बाधते, एवमन्यपदार्थेऽपि बाधेत ।

It should be read even in *ēkasaṁjñādhikārapakṣa*. If *anya* is not read, *tatpuruṣa* will veto *bahuvrīhi* even with reference to *anyapadārtha*, as it does with reference to *svapadārtha*.

1. *Cf.* Vol. V. pp. 16-17.

III

अथ अनेकग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is, then, *anēka* read?

अन्यपदार्थे इति इयत्युच्यमाने, एकस्यापि पदस्य बहुव्रीहिः स्यात् - सर्पिषोऽपि स्यात्, मधुनोऽपि स्यात्, गोमूत्रस्यापि स्यात्

If *anyapadārthē* alone is read, one word also may be taken as *bahuvrīhi* like *api* (which means a drop) in the expressions *sarpiṣōspi syāt*, *madhunōspi syāt* and *gōmūtrasyāpi syāt*.

NOTE: –*Kāiyaṭa* says, that *syāt*, in the opinion of some, means drop and it will be taken as *bahuvrīhi*.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् - सुप् सुपा इति वर्तते

This is not the benefit. There is *anuvṛtti* for *sup supā*.

इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनं, बहूनामपि समासो यथा स्यात् - सुसूक्ष्मजटकेशेन सुनताजिनवाससा ।

This, then, is the benefit that even more than two words as in *su-sūkṣma-jaṭa-kēśēna*, and *su-nata-ajina-vāsasā* can become *samāsa*.

उत्तरार्थं च अनेकग्रहणं कर्तव्यं 'चार्थे द्वन्द्वः', अनेकमिति । इहापि यथा स्यात् प्लक्षन्यग्रोधधवखदिरपलाशाः इति

The word *anēkam* has to be read also to reach by *anuvṛtti* the *sūtra Cārthē dvandvaḥ* which follows, to allow *samāsa* in *plakṣa-nyagrōdha-dhava-khadira-palāśāḥ*.

एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम् । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति बहूनामपि समासो भवतीति, यदयम् उत्तरपदे द्विगुं शास्ति ।

This, too, is not the benefit. The procedure of *Ācārya* (*Sūtrakāra*) suggests that more than two words form *samāsa*, since he enjoins *dvigu* when it is followed by another word.

NOTE: —*Kāiyaṭa* reads:-*Dvigugrahaṇam Taddhitārtha* ... (2, 1, 51) *ityanēna vihitasya samāsasya upalakṣaṇam*.

तत्पुरुषोऽपि तर्हि बहूनां प्राप्नोति

If so, more than two words may form *tatpuruṣa* too.

नैष दोषः, ग्रहणेन तत्पुरुष उच्यते; तेन बहूनां न भविष्यति

This difficulty cannot arise, since *tatpuruṣa* is enjoined with specific reference to the former member and the latter member. Hence there is no chance for more than two words to form *tatpuruṣa.*

अत उत्तरं पठति Hence he (*Vārttikakāra*) reads the answer.

अनेकवचनमुपसर्जनार्थम्

Reading of *anēkam* is for the sake of *upasarjanatva.*

अनेकग्रहणं क्रियते उपसर्जनार्थम्, प्रथमानिर्दिष्टं समास उपसर्जनम् इत्युपसर्जनसंज्ञा यथा स्यात् - चित्रगुः शबलगुः इति ।

The word *anēkam* is read for the sake of *upasarjanatva*, so that *gō* in *citraguḥ*, and *śabalagaḥ* may take *upsarjanasaṁjñā* by *Prathamānirdiṣṭam samāsa upasarianam* (1, 2, 43).

न वैकविभक्तित्वात्

No, it is secured from their taking the same case-suffix after them.

न वैतदपि प्रयोजनमस्ति This, too, is not the benefit.

किं कारणम्? Why?

एकविभक्तित्वात् । एकविभक्तिचापूर्वनिपाते इत्युपसर्जनसंज्ञा भविष्यति - चित्रगुः शबलगुः इति — चित्रा यस्य गावः चित्रगुः तिष्ठति; चित्रा यस्य गावः चित्रगुं पश्य [1]; चित्रा यस्य गावः चित्रगुणा कृतम्; चित्रा यस्य गावः चित्रगवे देहि; चित्रा यस्य गावः चित्रगोरानय; चित्रा यस्य गावः चित्रगोः स्वम्; चित्रा यस्य गावः चित्रगौ निधेहि; चित्रा यस्य गावः हे चित्रगो इति ॥

On account of their being *ēkavibhaktika. Upasarjanasaṁjñā* of *gō* in *citraguḥ* and *śabalaguḥ* is secured by the *sūtra Ekavibhakti cāpūrvanipātē* (1, 2, 44). *Ekavibhaktitva* is seen in the *vigrahavākya* here:-*citraguḥ* (*citrā gāvaḥ yasya*) *tiṣṭhati*; *citragum*, (*citrā gāvaḥ yasya*) *paśya*; *citraguṇā* (*citrā gāvaḥ yasya*) *kṛtam*; *citragavē* (*citrā gāvaḥ yasya*) *dēhi*; *citragōḥ* (*citrā gāvaḥ yasya*) *ānaya*; *citragōḥ* (*citrā gāvaḥ yasya*) *svam*; *citragāu* (*citrā gāvaḥ yasya*) *nidhēhi*; *Hē citragō* (*citrā gāvaḥ yasya*).

1. *Paśyēti* is another reading.

यदि तर्हि [1] यतः कुतश्चिदेव किञ्चित्पदमध्याहृत्य एकविभक्तियोगः क्रियते, एतदप्येकविभक्तियुक्तं भवति, इहापि प्राप्नोति - राजकुमारी, तक्षकुमारी - राज्ञो या कुमारी राजकुमारी तिष्ठति ; राज्ञो या कुमारी राजकुमारीं पश्य ; राज्ञो या कुमारी राजकुमार्या कृतं ; राज्ञो या कुमारी राजकुमार्यै देहि ; राज्ञो या कुमारी राजकुमार्या आनय ; राज्ञो या कुमारी राजकुमार्याः स्वं ; राज्ञो या कुमारी राजकुमार्यां निधेहि ; राज्ञो या कुमारी हे राजकुमारि इति ।

If some word is brought in from somewhere and *ēkavibhakti-yōga* is secured, the following too will be *ēkavibhaktiyukta* and hence *upasarjanatva* will appear in *kumārī* also of *rājakumārī* and *takṣakumārī*. *Ēkavibhaktitva* is seen here :– *Rājakumārī* (*rājñō yā kumārī*) *tiṣṭhati* ; *Rājakumārīm* (*rājñō yā kumārī*) *paśya* ; *Rājakumāryā* (*rājñō yā kumārī*) *kṛtam* ; *Rājakumāryāi* (*rājñō yō kumārī*) *dēhi* ; *Rājakumāryāḥ* (*rājñō yā kumārī*) *ānaya* ; *Rājakumāryāḥ* (*rājñō yā kumārī*) *svam* ; *Rājakumāryām* (*rājñō yā kumārī*) *nidhēhi* ; *Hē Rājakumāri* (*rājñō yā kumārī*).

एकविभक्तियुक्तमेव यन्नित्यम् । न चैतन्नित्यमेकविभक्तियुक्तमेव, राज्ञः कुमारीं पश्य राजकुमारीं पश्य इत्यपि भवति ।

The *ēkavibhaktiyuktatva* which is *nitya* is alone taken into account. The *ēkavibhaktiyuktatva* mentioned above is not *nitya*, since both the forms *Rājñaḥ kumārīm paśya* and *Rājakumārīm paśya* may be read.

किं वक्तव्यमेतत्? Is this to be so explained ?

न हि No, it need not

कथमनुच्यमानं गंस्यते ?

How is to be understood without its being so explained ?

एकग्रहणसामर्थ्यात् । यदि हि यदेकविभक्तियुक्तं चानेकविभक्तियुक्तं च तत्र स्याद्, एकग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात् । विभक्तियुक्तमपूर्वनिपाते इत्येव ब्रूयात् ।

By the strength of the reading of *ēka*. If both *ēkavibhakti-yuktatva* and *anēkavibhaktiyuktatva*, can be had, no purpose will be served by reading *ēka* and he would have read the *sūtra Vibhaktiyuktam apūrvanipātē*.

1. *Yataḥ* is not found in some editions.

IV

पदार्थाभिधानेऽनुप्रयोगानुपपत्तिरभिहितत्वात्

Inappropriateness of reading after *bahuvrīhi* compound a word in apposition, since its meaning has already been denoted by it.

पदार्थाभिधानेऽनुप्रयोगस्यानुपपत्तिः चित्रगुर्देवदत्त इति

If *bahuvrīhi* is *anyapadārthapradhāna*, it is in appropriate to use a word in apposition after it, as *Dēvadattaḥ* in *Citragur Dēvadattaḥ*.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

अभिहितत्वात् । चित्रगुशब्देनाभिहितः सोऽर्थ इति कृत्वा अनुप्रयोगो न प्राप्नोति

Since its meaning has already been denoted. Taking that its meaning is denoted by the word *citraguḥ*, the word *Dēvadattaḥ* has no place after it.

न वानभिहितत्वात् । सामान्यभिधाने हि विशेषानभिधानम्

No, on account of its meaning not being denoted. For the individuality is not denoted, though the species is denoted.

न चैष दोषः This difficulty does not arise.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

अनभिहितत्वात् । चित्रगुशब्देनानभिहितः सोऽर्थ इति कृत्वा अनुप्रयोगो भविष्यति

Since it is not denoted. Taking that its meaning is not denoted by the word *citragu*, the word *Dēvadattaḥ* is used after it.

कथमनभिहितः, यदिदानीमेवोक्तं - पदार्थाभिधानेऽनुप्रयोगानुपपत्तिरभिहित-त्वादिति

How can it be said that the meaning is not denoted, since just now this has been read [illegible]

सामान्याभिधाने हि विशेषानभिधानम् - सामान्ये हि अभिधीयमाने विशेषोऽनभिहितो भवति । तत्रावश्यं विशेषार्थिना विशेषोऽनुप्रयोक्तव्यः, चित्रगुः कः ? देवदत्त इति ।

On account of the individuality not being denoted at the mention of the species. For, even though the species, is denoted, the individuality is not denoted. Hence the word denoting the individuality has to be used by one who wants it to be denoted. He puts the question, "*Who is Citraguḥ?*" and answers "*Dēvadattaḥ.*"

भवेत् सिद्धं यदा सामान्ये वृत्तिः । यदा तु खलु विशेषे वृत्तिः, तदा न सिध्यति - चित्रा गावो देवदत्तस्येति चित्रगुर्देवदत्त इति ।

It is true if *padārthābhidhāna* is with reference to the species. If, on the other hand, it is with reference to individuality as in *citrā gāvō Dēvadattasya iti citragur Dēvadattaḥ* – it is not achieved.

तदापि सिद्धम् It is achieved even then.

कथम् ? How?

नेदमुभयं युगपद् भवति वाक्यं समासश्च । यदा वाक्यं, न तदा समासः ; यदा समासः, न तदा वाक्यम् यदा समासः, तदा सामान्ये वृत्तिः ; तत्र अवश्यं विशेषार्थिना विशेषोऽनुप्रयोक्तव्यः चित्रगुः कः ? देवदत्त इति ।

Both – sentence and *samāsa* - cannot be formed at the same time. When it is *vākya*, it is not *samāsa*; when it is *samāsa*, it is not *vākya*; when it is *samāsa*, *vṛtti* is with reference to species. In that case individuality has to be denoted by one who wants it by putting the question "Who is *Citraguḥ*?" and answering it "*Dēvadattaḥ.*"

सामान्यस्यैव तर्ह्यनुप्रयोगो न प्राप्नोति – चित्रगुः कः ? चित्रगु तत्, चित्रगु किञ्चित्, चित्रगु सर्वम् इति ।

If so, species can have no chance of being the predicate, as in *Citragu tat, Citragu kiñcit, Citragu sarvam* which serve as answers to the question *Citraguḥ kaḥ*?

NOTE :—The *pūrvapakṣin* here thinks that no pronoun, definite or indefinite, can be used in apposition with a *bahuvrīhi* compound after it.

सामान्यमपि यथा विशेषस्तद्वत् । तत्र चित्रगु इत्युक्ते सन्देहः स्यात् सर्वं वा अविश्वं वा इति । तत्रावश्यं सन्देहनिवृत्त्यर्थं विशेषार्थिना विशेषोऽनुप्रयोक्तव्यः, चित्रगु तद् इति

If species too has the differentiating capacity like the individuality, it will be used as a predicate. At the mention of *Citragu*, it is not clear whether the species is referred to or individuality. At this there is absolute need for the individuality to be used as predicate by one who wants it, as *citragu tat*.

NOTE :—Mention of *citragu tat* (that is *citragu*) by pointing to it by one serves as the answer to the question of another *citragu sarvam asarvam vā* ?

अथवा विभक्त्यर्थोऽभिधीयते । एतच्चात्र युक्तं यद्विभक्त्यर्थोऽभिधीयते, तत्र हि सर्वपश्चात्पदं वर्तते अस्य इति ।

Or the meaning of the case-suffix (like *sambandha*) is denoted by *samāsa*. It is but proper that the meaning of case-suffix is denoted. For, the word *asya* is used after all the words forming the compound.

विभक्त्यर्थाभिधानेऽद्रव्यस्य लिङ्गसङ्ख्योपचारानुपपत्तिः

If *vibhaktyartha* is denoted, there is inappropriateness of the *vyavahāra* of *liṅga* and *saṅkhyā* to it on account of its (the *sambandha*) being *adravya*.

विभक्त्यर्थाभिधाने अद्रव्यस्य लिङ्गसङ्ख्याभ्यामुपचारोऽनुपपन्नः - बहुयवं, बहुयवा, बहुयवः बहुयवौ बहुयवाः इति

If the meaning of *vibhakti* is denoted by the *samāsa*, the *vyavahāra* of *liṅga* and *saṅkhyā* to it is not appropriate, since it is not a *dravya* as in *bahuyavam* (neuter), *bahuyavā* (feminine) *bahuyavaḥ* (masculine singular), *bahuyavāu* (masculine dual) and *bahuyavāḥ* (masculine plural).

अपर आह - विभक्त्यर्थाभिधाने द्रव्यस्य लिङ्गसङ्ख्योपचारानुपपत्तिः । विभक्त्यर्थाभिधाने द्रव्यस्य ये लिङ्गसङ्ख्ये ताभ्यां विभक्त्यर्थस्योपचारोऽनुपपन्नः - बहुयवं, बहुयवा, बहुयवः, बहुयवौ, बहुयवाः इति । कथं ह्यन्यस्य लिङ्गसङ्ख्याभ्यामन्यस्योपचारः स्यात् ?

Another interprets *Vibhaktyarthābhidhānē dravyasya liṅgasaṅkhyōpacārānupapattiḥ* thus:—It is inappropriate to associate with *vibhaktyartha*, *liṅga* and *saṅkhyā* which are connected with *dravya*, if the meaning of *vibhakti* is taken to be conveyed by the *samāsa*.

NOTE:— *Vibhaktyarthābhidhānē dravyasya* is capable of being split in two ways, one having *adravyasya* and the other *dravyasya* as the following word.

सिद्धं तु यथा गुणवचनेषु

It is appropriate as in the words denoting qualities.

सिद्धमेतत् It is appropriate.

कथम् ? How ?

यथा गुणवचनेषु As in the words denoting qualities.

कथं गुणवचनेषु ?

How is it found in words denoting qualities ?

[1] गुणवचनेषूक्तम्

It has been said with reference to words denoting qualities.

[2] किमुक्तम् ? What has been said ?

गुणवचनानां हि शब्दानामाश्रयतो लिङ्गवचनानि भवन्ति इति । तद्यथा, शुक्लं वस्त्रं, शुक्ला शाटी, शुक्लः कम्बलः, शुक्लौ कम्बलौ, शुक्लाः कम्बला इति । यदसौ द्रव्यं श्रितो भवति गुणः, तस्य यल्लिङ्गं वचनं च तद् गुणस्यापि भवति । एवमिहापि यदसौ द्रव्यं श्रितो भवति विभक्त्यर्थः, तस्य यल्लिङ्गं वचनं च तत् समासस्यापि भविष्यति ।

1. *Cf.* Vol. IV p. 118 & p. 176.
2. This is not found in some editions.

That *liṅga* and *vacana* after the words denoting qualities agree with those of the *guṇivācakas*, viz. *śuklam vastram śuklā śāṭī, śuklaḥ kambalaḥ, śuklāu kambalāu, śuklāḥ kambalāḥ*. The *guṇavācaka* takes the *liṅga* and the *vacana* of the *guṇivācaka*. So also the *liṅga* and the *vacana* of the *dravya* with which *vibhaktyartha* is associated are used after the *samāsa*.

यदि तर्हि विभक्त्यर्थोऽभिधीयते, कृत्स्नः पदार्थः कथमभिहितो भवति सद्रव्यः सलिङ्गः ससङ्ख्यश्च ?

If, then, the meaning of *vibhakti* is denoted, how is it possible for the meaning of the whole word consisting of *dravya*, *liṅga* and *vacana* to be denoted by it?

अर्थग्रहणसामर्थ्यात् । इह अनेकमन्यपदे इति इयता सिद्धम् । कथं पुनः पदे नाम वृत्तिः स्यात् ? पदं नाम शब्दः, शब्दो ह्येषः । शब्दे ह्यसम्भवादर्थे कार्यं विज्ञास्यते । सोऽयम् एवं सिद्धे सति यदर्थग्रहणं करोति तस्यैतत्प्रयोजनं, कृत्स्नः पदार्थो यथाभिधीयते सद्रव्यः सलिङ्गः ससङ्ख्यश्चेति ।

On account of the *sāmarthya* of the reading of *artha* in the *sūtra*. It is sufficient if the *sūtra* is read *Anēkam unyapadē*. How can *samāsavṛtti* take place in *pada*? *Pada* means *śabda* and *śabda* refers to *samāsa*. Since *kārya* is not possible in *śabda*, it has to take place in its *artha*. Since *Ācārya* reads the word *artha* in the *sūtra* even though the purpose can otherwise be achieved, it suggests that *samāsa* conveys *vibhaktyartha* associated with the *dravya*, the *liṅga* and the *vacana*.

यदि तर्हि कृत्स्नः पदार्थोऽभिधीयते, लैङ्गाः साङ्ख्याश्च विधयो न सिध्यन्ति

If the whole meaning is conveyed, the rules enjoining *liṅga* and *saṅkhyā* will serve no purpose.

NOTE:—*Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* says that this is the view of *ēkadēśins*, since *prātipadika* has everywhere the meaning of the five.

उक्तं वा It has been answered.

किमुक्तम्? How has it been answered?

लैङ्गेषु तावदुक्तं, सिद्धं तु स्त्रियाः प्रातिपदिकविशेषणात् स्वार्थे टाबादय इति
With reference to the *liṅgas* it has been read by the *Vārttikakāra* (under 4, 1, 3) that the suffixes *ṭāp* etc. are used to suggest *strītva* after *prātipadikas* tho' the latter denote *strītva*.

साङ्ख्येष्वप्युक्तम्
It has been answered with reference to number also.

किमुक्तम्? How has it been answered?

कर्मादीनामनुक्ता एकत्वादय इति कृत्वा साङ्ख्या भविष्यन्ति
Number-denoting suffixes are used under the assumption that the number associated with *karman* etc. was not expressed.

प्रथमा तर्हि न प्राप्नोति
Nominative case-suffix will not, then, have a chance to be added to the stem, (since *saṅkhyā* is denoted by *samāsa.*)

समयाद्भविष्यति
It is used after the stem on the accepted principle that neither the stem nor the *pratyaya* should be used alone.

यदि सामयिकी न नियोगतः, अन्याः कस्मान्न भवन्ति?
If it is so on *samaya* and not on injunction, why are not other case-suffixes used after the stem?

कर्मादीनामभावात्
On account of *karmatva* etc. being absent there.

षष्ठी तर्हि प्राप्नोति Sixth case-suffix will, then, be added.

शेषलक्षणा षष्ठी, अशेषत्वान्न भविष्यति
Sixth case suffix is enjoined by the *sūtra Ṣaṣṭhī śēṣē* (2, 3, 50). There is no *śēṣatva* here.

एवमपि व्यतिकरः प्राप्नोति - एकस्मिन्नपि द्विवचनबहुवचने प्राप्नुतः, द्वयोरप्येकवचनबहुवचने, बहुष्वपि एकवचनद्विवचने
Even then there is chance for one suffix to be used in place of another: Where oneness is to be denoted, dual and plural suffixes also may appear in turn. Where *twoness* is to be

denoted, singular and plural suffixes also may appear. Where plurality is to be denoted, singular and dual suffixes also may appear (since there is *samaya* only with reference to the use of the nominative).

अर्थतो व्यवस्था भविष्यति

Their use will be determined through meaning.

अथ वा सङ्ख्या नामेयं परप्रधाना । सङ्ख्येयमनया विशेष्यम् । यदि चात्र प्रथमा न स्यात्, सङ्ख्येयमविशेषितं स्यात्

Or *saṅkhyā* is that which is subordinate to another. *Dravya*, the meaning of the stem, is to be qualified by it. If *prathamā* suffix is not used, *saṅkhyēya* will be left unqualified.

अथ वा वक्ष्यत्येतद् वचनग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनम् - उक्तेष्वप्येकत्वादिषु प्रथमा यथा स्यात्

Or he is going to say that the benefit of reading the word *vacana* in the *sūtra* *Prātipadikārthaliṅgaparimāṇavacanamātrē prathamā* (2, 3, 46) is *Uktēṣvāpi ēkatvādiṣu prathamā yathā syāt.*

एवमपि षष्ठी प्राप्नोति Even then there is chance for *ṣaṣṭhī*.

किं कारणम्? Why?

व्यभिचरत्येव ह्ययं समासो लिङ्गसङ्ख्ये, षष्ठ्यर्थं पुनर्न व्यभिचरति

This *samāsa* may convey different *liṅgas* and different *vacanas*, but ever conveys *sambandha*, the meaning of *ṣaṣṭhī*.

अभिहितः सोऽर्थोऽन्तर्भूतः प्रातिपदिकार्थः सम्पन्नः । तत्र प्रातिपदिकार्थे प्रथमेति प्रथमा भविष्यति

That meaning is denoted and it becomes included in the meaning of the *prātipadika*. Hence nominative suffixes set in on the strength of *Prātipadikārthē prathamā*.

न तर्हि इदानीमिदं भवति - चित्रगोर्देवदत्तस्य

In that case there is no possibility here for the expression *Citragōr Dēvadattasya*.

भवति बाह्यमर्थमपेक्ष्य षष्ठी

Sixth case suffix is used to signify its relation to an external object.

V

परिगणनं कर्तव्यम् It is necessary to take an inventory.

बहुव्रीहिः समानाधिकरणानाम्

Bahuvrīhi is among those which are in apposition.

समानाधिकरणानां बहुव्रीहिर्वक्तव्यः

There is need to enjoin that *bahuvrīhi* appears only among those which are in apposition.

किं प्रयोजनम् ? Why ?

व्यधिकरणानां मा भूद् इति - पञ्चभिर्भुक्तमस्य

To prevent it among those which are not in apposition, as in *Pañcabhir bhuktam asya*.

अव्ययानां च Of *avyayas* too.

अव्ययानां च बहुव्रीहिर्वक्तव्यः - उच्चैर्मुखमस्य इति उच्चैर्मुखः, नीचैर्मुखः ।

It is necessary to enjoin that *avyayas* also can be components in *bahuvrīhi*, as in *uccāirmukhaḥ* (*uccāiḥ mukham asya*) and *nīcāirmukhaḥ*.

सप्तम्युपमानपूर्वपदस्योत्तरपदलोपश्च

Uttarapadalōpa in *saptamī-pūrvapada-bahuvrīhi* and *upamāna-pūrvapada-bahuvrīhi*.

सप्तमीपूर्वस्य उपमानपूर्वस्य च बहुव्रीहिर्वक्तव्यः, उत्तरपदस्य च लोपो वक्तव्यः ।
कण्ठेस्थः कालोऽस्य कण्ठेकालः, उष्ट्रमुखमिव मुखमस्य उष्ट्रमुखः, खरमुखः

It must be read that a *bahuvrīhi* can have the former member a noun in the seventh case or *upamāna-vācaka* with the latter member dropping itself. *Viz. Kaṇṭhēkālaḥ* (*kaṇṭhēsthaḥ kālaḥ asya*); *uṣṭramukhaḥ* (*uṣṭramukham iva mukham asya*), *kharamukhaḥ*.

समुदायविकारषष्ठ्याश्च

Bahuvrīhi with a word which follows *samudāya-vācakapada* or *vikāravācakapada* of a word ending in the sixth case preceding it and the elision of the word following the first.

समुदायविकारषष्ठ्याश्च बहुव्रीहिर्वक्तव्यः । उत्तरपदस्य च लोपो वक्तव्यः ।
केशसमाहारश्चूडा अस्य केशचूडः । सुवर्णस्य विकारोऽलङ्कारो यस्य सुवर्णालङ्कारः ।

There is need to enjoin that there is *bahuvrīhi* of a word ending in *samudāya* or *vikāra* and preceded by a word in relation of the sixth case with another where the latter word elides. *Viz. Kēśacūdaḥ (kēśasamāhāraḥ cūḍā asya)*; *suvarṇālaṅkāraḥ (suvarnasya vikārō alaṅkārō yasya).*

प्रादिभ्यो धातुजस्य वा

Bahuvrīhi of verbal nouns preceded by *pra* etc. with their optional elision.

प्रादिभ्यो धातुजस्य बहुव्रीहिर्वक्तव्यः । उत्तरपदस्य च वा लोपो वक्तव्यः - प्रपतितपर्णः प्रपर्णः, प्रपतितपलाशः प्रपलाशः ।

It must be enjoined that there is *bahuvrīhi* between verbal nouns preceded by *pra* etc. (and the word that is *samartha*) where the verbal noun man be optionally dropped. viz. *prapatitaparṇaḥ, praparṇaḥ*; *prapatitapalāśaḥ, prapalāśaḥ.*

नञोऽस्त्यर्थानां च

Bahuvrīhi also of the verbal nouns which mean to exist and which are preceded by *nañ.*

नञोऽस्त्यर्थानां बहुव्रीहिर्वक्तव्यः । उत्तरपदस्य च वा लोपो वक्तव्यः - अविद्यमानः पुत्रोऽअस्य, ; अविद्यमानपुत्रः अपुत्रः ; अविद्यमानभार्यः अभार्यः

It must be enjoined that there is *bahuvrīhi* between verbal nouns meaning to exist and preceded by *nañ* (and the word that is *samartha*) where the verbal noun is optionally dropped. viz. *Avidyamānaputraḥ, aputraḥ (avidyamānaḥ putraḥ asya)*; *avidyamānabhāryaḥ, abhāryaḥ.*

तर्हि बहु वक्तव्यम् If so, much has to be said.

न वानभिधानादसमानाधिकरणेषु समाससंज्ञाभावः

There is no need for *parigaṇana*; the absence of *samāsasaṃjñā* in places which are not *samānādhikaraṇas* on account of the absence of *anyapadartha.*

न वा वक्तव्यम् There is no need to make the *parigaṇana.*

असमानाधिकरणानां बहुव्रीहिः कस्मान्न भवति - पञ्चभिर्भुक्तमस्य इति ?

On what authority will there be no *bahuvrīhi* between words which are not in apposition, as in *pañcabhir bhuktam asya?*

अनभिधानात्

On account of the absence of *anyapadārthābhidhāna.*

तच्चावश्यम् अनभिधानमाश्रयितव्यम् । क्रियमाणेऽपि परिगणने यत्राभिधानं न भवति तत्र न बहुव्रीहिः - यथा पञ्च भुक्तवन्तो अस्य इति

It is necessary to take recourse to *anabhidhāna*. There will be no *bahuvrīhi* if there is *anabhidhāna*, even though it comes within *pariganana*, as in *pañca bhuktavantaḥ asya.*

अथैतस्मिन् सति अनभिधाने यदि वृत्तिपरिगणनं क्रियेत, तर्हि वर्तिपरिगणनमपि कर्तव्यम्

If the *pariganana* of *vṛttyāśrayapadas* is made where there is *anabhidhāna*, there is need for the *pariganana* of *samāsārthas* too.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* reads:- *Vartanam vartaḥ samāsaḥ; sa vidyatē yasmin arthē sa vartī.*

तत् कथं कर्तव्यम् ? How is to be done ?

अर्थनियमे मत्वर्थग्रहणम्

Need to include matvartha among the categorical list of arthas.

अर्थनियमे मत्वर्थग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्, मत्वर्थे यः स बहुव्रीहिरिति वक्तव्यम्; इह मा भूत्, कष्टं श्रितमनेन इति

It is necessary to include *matvartha* among the categorical list of *arthas* thus :-*matvarthē yaḥ sa bahuvrīhiḥ*, so that it may not take place here in *kaṣṭam śritam anēna.*

तथा चोत्तरस्य वचनार्थः

Then only is the reading of the following *sūtra* fruitful.

एवं च कृत्वा उत्तरस्य योगस्य वचनार्थ उपपन्नो भवति

Only then the reading of the *sūtra* that follows bears appropriate fruit.

केचित्तावदाहुः - यद्वृत्तिसूत्रे इति सङ्ख्ययाऽव्ययासन्नादूराधिकसङ्ख्याः सङ्ख्येये इति

Some take that *uttarasya* refers to the next *samāsavidhāyaka-sūtra* (i.e.) *Saṅkhyāvyayāsannādūrādhikasaṅkhyāḥ saṅkhyēyē.*

अपर आहुः, 'यद्वार्त्तिके इति'

Others take it to refer to the following *vārttika*."

कर्मवचनेनाप्रथमायाः

Bahuvrīhi of a word not having the meaning of the first case (i.e. past participle) with the noun serving as the object is to be enjoined.

कर्मवचनेन अप्रथमाया बहुव्रीहिर्वक्तव्यः । ऊढो रथो येन ऊढरथोऽनड्वान् । उपहृतः पशू रुद्राय उपहृतपशू रुद्रः ; उद्धृत ओदनः स्थाल्याः - उद्धृतौदना स्थाली ।

It must be enjoined that a word not having the meaning of the first case with the noun serving as the object forms *bahuvrīhi*. *Viz.* *ūḍharathaḥ* (*ūḍhō rathō yēna*) *anaḍvān*; *Upahṛtapaśuḥ* (*upahṛtaḥ paśuḥ rudrāya*) *Rudraḥ*; *Uddhṛtāudanā* (*uddhṛtaḥ ōdanaḥ sthālyāḥ*) *sthālī*.

NOTE:—1. *Ratha* is *karmavācaka* and *ūḍha* is *karmabōdhaka*.

यदि कर्मवचनेनेत्युच्यते, अथ कर्तृवचनेन कथम् - प्राप्तमुदकं ग्रामं प्राप्तोदको ग्रामः, आगता अतिथयो ग्रामम् आगतातिथिर्ग्रामः ?

If it is said that *karmabōdhaka* and *karmavacana* compound into *bahuvrīhi*, what sanctions the compound of *kartṛbōdhaka* and *kartṛvacana*, as in *prāptōdakaḥ* (*prāptam udakam grāmam*) *grāmaḥ* and *āgatātithiḥ* (*āgatāḥ atithayō grāmam*) *grāmaḥ*?

कर्तृवचनेनापि With *kartṛvacana* too.

कर्तृवचनेनापि इति वक्तव्यम्

It must be enjoined that *kartṛbōdhaka* compounds with *kartṛvācaka* too.

अप्रथमाया इति किमर्थम् ? Why is *aprathamāyāḥ* read?

वृष्टे देवे गतः

To prevent *samāsa* between *vṛṣṭē* and *dēvē* which precede *gataḥ* (i.e.) when *samāsārtha* is that of the nominative case.

अथ अप्रथमायाः इत्युच्यमाने इह कस्मान्न भवति - वृष्टे देवे गतं पश्य इति !

Why is there no *samāsa* between *vṛṣṭē* and *dēvē* in *vṛṣṭē dēvē gatam paśya* on the strength of *aprathamāyāḥ*?

बहिरङ्गात्राप्रथमा *Aprathamā* here is *bahiraṅga.*

NOTE :—The question arises on seeing the second case in *gatam.* Since the *samāsārtha-prathamā* is *antaraṅga,* it vetoes *dvitīyā* after *gata* which is *bahiraṅga.*

सुबधिकारे अस्तिक्षीरादिवचनम्

Reading of *astikṣīra* etc. in *sub-adhikāra.*

सुबधिकारे अस्तिक्षीरादीनामुपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - अस्तिक्षीरा ब्राह्मणी
There is need for *upasaṅkhyāna* of expressions like *asti-kṣīra* in *sub-adhikāra.* Viz. *astikṣīrā brāhmaṇī.*

तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be enjoined.

NOTE :—This arises on the assumption that *asti* is a finite verb.

न वाऽव्ययत्वात् No, since it is *avyaya.*

न वा कर्तव्यम् It need not be enjoined.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

अव्ययत्वात् । अव्ययमेषोऽस्तिशब्दः, नैषोऽस्तेर्लट्
Since it is *avyaya.* This *asti* is *avyaya* and not the third person singular, present, of *as.*

कथमव्ययत्वम् ? How is it *avyaya?*

उपसर्गविभक्तिस्वरप्रतिरूपकाश्च निपातसंज्ञा भवन्तीति निपातसंज्ञा, निपातोऽव्ययमित्यव्ययसंज्ञा ।
It, being a *nipāta,* gets *avyaya-saṁjñā* on the strength of *Nipātōsvyayam* and it gets *nipātasaṁjñā* since it is *tiṅanta-pratirūpaka,* on the strength of the statement *upasarga-vibhaktisvara-pratirūpakāś ca.*

VI

अथ किंसब्रह्मचारी इति कोऽयं समासः ?

What *samāsa* is, then, the word *kiṁsabrahmacārī* in the sentence *kiṁsabrahmacārī tvam?*

बहुव्रीहिरित्याह "*Bahuvrīhi*" say he.

कोऽस्य विग्रहः ? What is its *vigraha* ?

के सब्रह्मचारिणः अस्य इति *Kē sabrahmacāriṇaḥ asya.*

यद्येवं कठ इति प्रतिवचनं नोपपद्यते

If so, the answer *kaṭhaḥ* to that question does not suit well.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that singular in *kaṭhaḥ* does not agree with the plural in *kē.*

एवं तर्हि एवं विग्रहः करिष्यते - केषां सब्रह्मचारी किंसब्रह्मचारीति

If so, the *vigraha* of *kiṁsabrahmacārī* will be worded thus:—*kēṣām sabrahmacārī.*

प्रतिवचनं चैवं नोपपद्यते, स्वरे च दोषो किंसब्रह्मचारी इत्येवं स्वरः प्रसज्येत, किंसब्रह्मचारीति चेष्यते ।

Even then the answer (*kaṭhaḥ*) does not suit. There will be difficulty with reference to the *udātta* syllable also. It will chance to have *antōdāttatva* thus—*kiṁsabrahmacārī'*, though *ādyudāttatva* is desired thus—*kiṁ'sabrahmacārī.*

एवं तर्हि एवं विग्रहः करिष्यते, कः सब्रह्मचारी किंसब्रह्मचारी इति

If so, the *vigraha* of *kiṁsabrahmacārī* will be worded thus:—*kaḥ sabrahmacārī.*

भवेत् प्रतिवचनमुपपन्नम् । स्वरे च दोषो भवति

The answer will suit the question ; but there will be difficulty with reference to the *udātta* syllable.

एवं तर्हि एवं विग्रहः करिष्यते - कः सब्रह्मचारी तव, किंसब्रह्मचारी त्वम् इति

If so, the *vigraha* of the first word in *kiṁsabrahmacārī tvam* will be worded thus:—*kaḥ sabrahmacārī tava.*

अथ वा पुनरस्त्वयमेव विग्रहः - के सब्रह्मचारिणोऽस्य इति

Or, let this alone be the *vigraha*—*kē sabrahmacāriṇō asya.*

ननु चोक्तं कठ इति प्रतिवचनं नोपपद्यत इति

Oh, it has been said that the answer *kaṭhaḥ* does not suit well (since the word will refer to him and not to his classmates).

नैष दोषः । अग्नौकरवाणिन्यायेन भविष्यति

This difficulty does not arise. It may be met with by the application of *agnāu-karavāṇi-nyāya*.

तद्यथा – It is as follows :-

कश्चित् कञ्चिद् आह अग्नौ करवाणि इति । स आह कुरु इति । कर्तरि अनुज्ञाते कर्माप्यनुज्ञातं भवति । अपर आह - अग्नौ करिष्ये इति । क्रियताम् इति कर्मण्यनुज्ञाते कर्ताप्यनुज्ञातो भवति ।

One doer of a religious rite says to another (*brahmā* in the rite) '*Agnāu karavāṇi*' (Let me offer the oblation in fire). He replies, "*Kuru*." When he who gives the offering is permitted, it is implied that the offering also is permitted to be thrown in fire. Another says, "*Agnāu kariṣyē*" (I shall offer the oblation in fire). The other permits him thus, "*Kriyatām*" (let it be offered). When the offering is permitted to be thrown in fire, it is implied that the giver of the offering too is permitted to offer it in fire.

यथैव खल्वपि के सब्रह्मचारिणोऽस्य ? इति, कठाः इत्युक्ते सम्बन्धादेतद्गम्यते - नूनमयमपि कठः इति । एवं कठ इत्युक्ते सम्बन्धादेतद् गन्तव्यं स्याद् नूनं तेऽपि कठाः इति । न खल्वपि ते समासेन शक्याः प्रतिनिर्देष्टुम्; उपसर्जनं हि ते भवन्ति

As he who answers *kaṭhāḥ* to the question *kē sabrahmacāriṇaḥ asya*? is understood from the relation to be a *kaṭha* himself, so also if the answer here is *kaṭha*, it is to be understood from the *sambandha* that they (his classmates) are also certainly *kaṭhās*. It is not possible for them too to be expressed in the *samāsa*, they being *upasarjana*.

VII

अथ अर्द्धतृतीया इति कोऽयं समासः ?

What *samāsa* is, then, the word *arddhatṛtīyāḥ*?

NOTE :—*Arddhatṛtīyāḥ* means *two and a half*.

बहुव्रीहिरित्याह "*Bahuvrīhi*" says he.

1. The word *arddhapañcamān* followed by *māsān* in *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra* is of the same type.

कोऽस्य विग्रहः? What is its *vigraha*?

अर्द्धं तृतीयमेषाम् इति

Arddham tṛtīyam ēṣām (those of which half of third forms a part).

कः समासार्थः? समासार्थो नोपपद्यते । अन्यपदार्थो हि नाम स भवति, येषां पदानां समासः ततोऽन्यस्य पदस्य अर्थो अन्यपदार्थः ।

What is *samāsārtha*? *Samāsārtha* cannot be satisfactorily enunciated. For it is evidently *anyapadārtha*. *Anyapadārtha* is one which is not denoted by the parts which form the compound.

एवं तर्हि एवं विग्रहः करिष्यते - अर्द्धं तृतीयमनयोः इति

If so, the *vigraha* will be worded thus:—*Arddham tṛtīyam anayōḥ*.

एवमपि कः षष्ठ्यर्थः? षष्ठ्यर्थो नोपपद्यते । किं हि तयोरर्धं भवति?

Even then, what is the meaning of *ṣaṣṭhī*? The relationship denoted by *ṣaṣṭhī* in *anayōḥ* cannot satisfactorily qualify *tṛtīyam*, which becomes half of them? (i.e.) can the third become half of them?

अस्तु तर्हि अयमेव विग्रहः - अर्द्धं तृतीयमेषाम् इति

If so, the original *vigraha* alone *arddham tṛtīyam ēṣām* may be resorted to.

ननु चोक्तम समासार्थो नोपपद्यते इति

Oh, it was said that the *samāsārtha* cannot be satisfactorily enunciated.

नैष दोषः । अवयवेन विग्रहः । समुदायः समासार्थः

This difficulty does not arise. *Vigrahavākya* is on *avayavārtha* and *samudāya* (two plus half of the third) is *samāsārtha*.

यद्यवयवेन विग्रहः समुदायः समासार्थः, असिद्वितीयोऽनुससार पाण्डवम्, सङ्कर्षणद्वितीयस्य बलं कृष्णस्य वर्द्धताम् इति द्वयोर्द्विवचनमिति द्विवचनं प्राप्नोति ।

If it is admitted that the *vigraha* is on *avayavārtha* and *samudāya* is *samāsārtha*, there is chance for the dual suffix at the end of *asidvitīyaḥ* and *Saṅkarṣaṇa-dvitīyasya* in the sentences

Asi-dvitīyōsnusasāra Pāṇḍavam.

Saṅkarṣaṇadvitīyasya balam Kṛṣṇasya varddhatām on the authority of *Dvayōr dvivacanam* (1, 4, 22).

अस्तु तर्हि अयमेव विग्रहः - अर्द्धं तृतीयमनयोः इति

Let this alone be then the *vigraha arddham tṛtīyam anayōḥ.*

ननु चोक्तं षष्ठ्यर्थो नोपपद्यत इति

Oh, it has been said that it is not possible to give a satisfactory meaning to *ṣaṣṭhī.*

नैष दोषः । इदं तावदयं प्रष्टव्यः - अथेह देवदत्तस्य भ्राता इति कः षष्ठ्यर्थ इति

This defect cannot stand. The objector is to be put this question – what is the meaning of the *ṣaṣṭhī* in the expression *Dēvadattasya bhrātā ?*

तत्रैतत् स्यात् - एकस्मात् प्रादुर्भाव इति

It is possible to state that the meaning there is the origin from the same source.

एतच्च वार्तम् । तद्यथा - सार्थिकानामेकप्रतिश्रये उषितानां प्रातरुत्थाय प्रतिष्ठमानानां न कश्चित् परस्परमभिसम्बन्धो भवति । एवंजातीयकं भ्रातृत्वं नाम । अत्र चेद्युक्तः षष्ठ्यर्थो दृश्यते, इहापि युक्तो दृश्यताम् ।

It is a flimsy answer. There is absolutely no relationship among travellers who stay at a certain place for the night and go away in different directions at sunrise. The relationship between brothers is of the same nature. If it is considered that *ṣaṣṭhyartha* is appropriate there, it may be considered that it is appropriate here also.

इह तर्हि, अर्द्धतृतीया आनीयन्ताम् इत्युक्ते अर्द्धस्यानयनं न प्राप्नोति

If so, when it is said *Arddhatṛtīyā ānīyantām*, there is no chance for the *arddha* to be brought.

NOTE :— *Kāiyaṭa* reads :- *Dvayōr ēva samāsārthatvād ānayanam syād nārdhasya.*

अस्तु तर्हि अयमेव विग्रहः अर्द्धं तृतीयमेषाम् इति

If so, let the *vigraha* be *arddham tṛtīyam ēṣām.*

ननु चोक्तम् - असिद्वितीयोऽनुससार पाण्डवम्, सङ्कर्षणद्वितीयस्य बलं कृष्णस्य वर्द्धताम् इति द्वयोर्द्विवचनमिति द्विवचनं प्राप्नोति इति ।

Oh, it has been said that dual suffix may appear on the strength of *Dvayōr dvivacanam,* in the words *asidvitīyaḥ* and *Saṅkarṣaṇadvitīyasya* of the sentences

Asi-dvitīyōsnusasāra Pāṇḍavam.

Saṅkarṣaṇa-dvitīyasya balam Kṛṣṇasya varddhatām.

नैष दोषः । अयं तीयान्तः शब्दोऽस्त्येव पूरणे वर्तते, अस्ति सहायवाची । तद्यः सहायवाची तस्येदं ग्रहणम्, असिद्वितीयः - असिसहाय इति गम्यते

This difficulty does not arise. The word ending in *tīya* has the sense of *pūraṇa* and also *sahāya.* It means *sahāya* in the word *asi-dvitīyaḥ*, so that it means *asi-sahāyaḥ.*

एवमपि अर्द्धतृतीयाः इत्येकस्मिन्नेकवचनं प्राप्नोति । एकार्था हि समुदाया भवन्ति । तद्यथा-शतं, यूथं, वनम् इति

Even then there is chance for the singular in place of the plural in the word *arddhatṛtīyāḥ* on the strength of *Ekasmin ēkavacanam.* For *samudāyas* are collective in sense, as the words *śatam, yūtham* and *vanam.*

अस्तु तर्हि अयमेव विग्रहः - अर्द्धं तृतीयमनयोरिति

If so, let the *vigraha* be *arddham tṛtīyam anayōḥ.*

ननु चोक्तम् अर्द्धतृतीया आनीयन्ताम् इत्युक्ते अर्द्धस्य आनयनं न प्राप्नोति इति

Oh, it has been said that there is no chance for bringing *arddha* when one says *Arddhatṛtīyā ānīyantām.*

नैष दोषः । भवति बहुव्रीहौ तद्गुणसंविज्ञानमपि । तद्यथा शुक्लवाससमानय, लोहितोष्णीषाः ऋत्विजः प्रचरन्ति इति तद्गुण आनीयते, तद्गुणाश्च प्रचरन्ति ।

This difficulty does not arise. *Tadguṇasaṁvijñāna-bahuvrīhi* too is included under *bahuvrīhi.* For instance, if one says *Śuklavāsasam ānaya* and *Lōhitōṣṇīṣāḥ ṛtvijaḥ pracaranti,* the man who wears the white cloth is brought and the *ṛtviks* who wear red turbans walk.

अथवा पुनरस्तु अयमेव विग्रहः अर्द्धं तृतीयमेषामिति

Or let the *vigraha* be *arddham tṛtīyam ēṣām* itself.

ननु चोक्तम् एकवचनं प्राप्नोति इति

Oh, it has been said that the singular-suffix may appear there.

नैष दोषः । सङ्ख्या नामेयं परप्रधाना । सङ्ख्येयमनया विशेष्यम् । यदि चात्र एकवचनं स्यात् सङ्ख्येयमविशेषितं स्यात्

This difficulty does not arise. Number depends upon another. The object to be numbered is to be restricted in its application by this. It *ēkavacana* is used here, it cannot serve as the *viśēṣaṇa* to the *viśēṣya*.

इह तर्हि अर्द्धतृतीया द्रोणा इति, अयं द्रोणशब्दः समुदाये प्रवृत्तो अवयवे नोपपद्यते

Here, then, in *arddhatṛtīyā drōṇāḥ* the word *drōṇa* is used to denote *samudāya* and hence cannot be taken to denote *avayava*.

नैष दोषः । समुदायेषु हि प्रवृत्ताः शब्दा अवयवेष्वपि वर्तन्ते । तद्यथा - पूर्वे पञ्चालाः, उत्तरे पञ्चालाः; तैलं भुक्तं, घृतं भुक्तम्; शुक्लो नीलः कपिल इति । एवमयं समुदाये द्रोणशब्दः प्रवृत्तोऽवयवेष्वपि वर्तते ।

This defect cannot arise. For words denoting wholes are used to denote parts also. *Viz.* East *Pañcāla*, North *Pañcāla*; *taila* is taken in, *ghṛta* is taken in; white, blue and brown, objects.[1] *So also the word drōṇa used to denote the whole* may also denote a part also.

कामं तर्हि अनेनैव हेतुना यदा द्वौ द्रोणौ अर्धाढकं च तदा कर्तव्यम् अर्धतृतीया द्रोणा इति

It may then be possibe that, on the same basis, the expression *arddhatṛtīyā drōṇāḥ* may be used to denote 2 *drōṇas* and a half *āḍhaka*.

न कर्तव्यम् । समुदायेषु वृत्ताः शब्दाः केष्ववयवेषु वर्तन्ते? योऽवयवस्तं समुदायं न व्यभिचरति

No, it cannot be used. Which *avayavas* can be denoted by words denoting wholes? The *avayava* which co-exists with the whole.

कं च समुदायं न व्यभिचरति ?

Which *avayava* co-exists with which whole ?

1. *Cf.* Vol. I (2nd edn.) p. 63

अर्द्धद्रोणो द्रोणम् *Arddhadrōṇa* co-exists with *drōṇa.*

अर्द्धाढकं पुनर्व्यभिचरति

But *arddhāḍhaka* exists even where *drōṇa* does not exist.

NOTE :—*Bhaṭṭōjidīkṣita* says in his *Śabdakāustubha* thus :—*Dvāu drōṇāu arddhadrōṇaś ca arddhatṛtīyā drōṇā iti vyavahriyatē ... Drōṇaśabdaś ca drōṇayōr arddhadrōṇē ca lakṣaṇayā.*

सङ्ख्ययाव्ययासन्नादूराधिकसङ्ख्याः सङ्ख्येये (2, 2, 25)

There are *four* topics here :—1-3. The nature of the *samāsa* and the *vigrahavākya* of *dvitrāḥ, dvidaśāḥ,* and *upadaśāḥ* (4) The need for *saṅkhyā* in the *sūtra.*

I

द्वित्राः, त्रिचतुराः इति कोऽयं समासः ?

What is the nature of the *samāsa* in *dvitrāḥ* and *tricaturāḥ?*

बहुव्रीहिरित्याह "*Bahuvrīhi,*" says he.

कोऽस्य विग्रहः ? What is its *vigraha* (of *dvitrāḥ*) ?

द्वौ वा त्रयो वा इति *Dvāu vā trayō vā.*

भवेद्यदा बहूनामानयनं तदा बहुवचनमुपपन्नम्; यदा तु खलु द्वावानीयेते तदा न सिध्यति

The use of the plural (in *dvitrāḥ*) will be appropriate when many are referred to and it is not so when only two are referred to,

तदापि सिद्धम् It is appropriate even in the latter case.

कथम्? How ?

केचित्तावदाहुः, अनिर्ज्ञातेऽर्थे बहुवचनं प्रयोक्तव्यम् इति । तद्यथा - कति भवतः पुत्राः? कति भवतो भार्याः ? इति

Some opine that plural number should be used in the question when the speaker is unaware of the number of objects he refers to, as in *kati bhavataḥ putrāḥ* (how many sons have you?) and *kati bhavatō bhāryāḥ* (how many wives have you ?)

अपर आह - द्वौ वा इत्युक्ते त्रयो वा इति गम्यते ; त्रयो वा इत्युक्ते द्वौ वा इति गम्यते । सैषा पञ्चाधिष्ठाना वाक्, तत्र युक्तं बहुवचनम्

Another says, "When *dvāu vā* is expressed, *trayō vā* is suggested ; and *vice versa.* The expression here is concerned with five and hence plural number fits in.

NOTE :—*Vā* here expresses *doubt* and not *option,*

II

अथ द्विदशाः त्रिदशाः इति कोऽयं समासः ?

Of what nature is the *samāsa* in *dvidaśāḥ* and *tridaśāḥ* ?

बहुव्रीहिरित्याह "*Bahuvrīhi,*" says he.

कोऽस्य विग्रहः ? What is its *vigraha* (of *dvidaśāḥ*) ?

द्विर्दश द्विदशा इति The vigraha of *dvidaśāḥ* is *dviḥ*[1] *daśa.*

सङ्ख्यासमासे सुजन्तत्वात्सङ्ख्याप्रसिद्धिः

Absence of *saṅkhyāvācitva* (of *dviḥ*) on account of *sujantatva* in *saṅkhyāsamāsa.*

सङ्ख्यासमासे सुजन्तत्वात् सङ्ख्या इति अप्रसिद्धिः । न हि सुजन्ता सङ्ख्या अस्ति

There is no possibility of *saṅkhyāvācitva* (of *dviḥ*) on account of *sujantatva* in *saṅkhyāsamāsa* ; for *sujanta* cannot be called *saṅkhyā.*

एवं तर्हि एवं विग्रहः करिष्यते, द्वौ दशतौ [2] द्विदशा इति

If so, the *vigraha* of *dvidaśāḥ* is taken to be *dvāu daśatāu.*

एवमपि अत्कारान्तत्वात् [3] सङ्ख्येत्यप्रसिद्धिः । न ह्यत्कारान्ता सङ्ख्या अस्ति

Even then there is no possibility of *saṅkhyāvācitva* (of *daśat*) on account of *atkārāntatva ;* for the word ending in *at* is not a *saṅkhyāvācaka,*

1. *Suc* in *dviḥ* is from the *sūtra Dvitricaturbhyaḥ suc* (5, 4, 18).
2. *Daśat* is secured from the *sūtra Pañcad daśatāu varge vā* (5, 1, 60).
3. *Saṅkhyayā* is another reading.

अस्तु तर्ह्ययमेव विग्रहः, द्विर्दश द्विदशा इति
If so, let the *vigraha* be *dvir daśa* itself.

ननु चोक्तम् सङ्ख्यासमासे सुजन्तत्वात् सङ्ख्येत्यप्रसिद्धिः इति
Oh, it was said that there is *aprasiddhi* of *saṅkhyā* of *dviḥ* on account of *sujantatva* in *saṅkhyāsamāsa*.

न वासुजन्तत्वात् No, it being *asujanta*.

न वैष दोषः This difficulty does not arise.

किं कारणम्? Why?

असुजन्तत्वात । सुजन्तत्वादित्युच्यते, न चात्र सुजन्तं पश्यामः
Since it is not *sujanta*. The objection is raised on the basis of its being *sujanta* and we do not see *sujanta* here.

किं पुनः कारणं वाक्ये सुज् दृश्यते, समासे तु न दृश्यते?
Why is *suj* present in *vigrahavākya* and absent in *samāsa*?

सुजभावोऽभिहितार्थत्वात् समासे
Absence of *suc* in *samāsa* on account of its meaning being conveyed by *samāsa*.

समासे सुजभावः There is no *suc* in *samāsa*.

किं कारणम्? Why?

अभिहितार्थत्वात् । अभिहितः सुजर्थः समासेनेति कृत्वा समासे सुज् न भविष्यति ।
On account of *abhihitārthatva*. *Suc* is absent in *samāsa*, since its meaning is conveyed by *samāsa*.

किं च भोः सुजर्थे इति समास उच्यते?
Oh, sir! is the *samāsa* enjoined to convey *sujartha*?

न खलु सुजर्थे इत्युच्यते, गम्यते तु सुजर्थः
No, the *samāsa* is not enjoined to convey *sujartha*; but *sujartha* is secured through implication.

कथम्? How?

यावता सङ्ख्येयो यः सङ्ख्यया सङ्ख्यायते । स च क्रियाभ्यावृत्त्यर्थः । स चोक्तः समासेनेति कृत्वा समासे सुज् न भविष्यति ।

Since the *saṅkhyēya* which is denoted by *saṅkhyā* is secured through the repetition of *kriyā* and since it is conveyed by the *samāsa*, *suc* does not present itself in the *samāsa*.

अशिष्यः सङ्ख्योत्तरपदः सङ्ख्येयवाभिधायित्वात्

Saṅkhyōttarapadabahuvrīhi need not be enjoined on account of its conveying the sense of *saṅkhyēya* and *vā*.

अशिष्यः सङ्ख्योत्तरपदो बहुव्रीहिः

The *bahuvrīhi* which has *saṅkhyā-vācaka* for the second member need not be enjoined.

किं कारणम् Why?

सङ्ख्येयवाभिधायित्वात्

Since the sense of *saṅkhyēya* and *vā* is conveyed by the *samāsa*.

सङ्ख्येयं वार्थश्च अभिधीयते, तत्रान्यपदार्थे इत्येव सिद्धम्

The sense of both *saṅkhyēya* and the meaning of *vā* is conveyed and hence it is secured on the strength of *anya-padārthē*.

भवेत् सिद्धमधिकविंशाः अधिकत्रिंशा इति, यत्रैतद् विचार्यते विंशत्यादयो दशदर्थे वा स्युः परिमाणिनि वा इति । इदं तु न सिध्यति - अधिकदशा इति यत्र नियोगतः सङ्ख्या सङ्ख्येये एव वर्तते ।

It may be achieved with reference to *adhikaviṁśāḥ* and *adhika-triṁśāḥ*, since it is discussed (under 5, 1, 59) that *viṁśati* etc. may refer to *daśadartha* (*saṅkhyā*) or *parimāṇin* (*saṅkhyēya*). But the form *adhikadaśāḥ* cannot be secured, where the number *daśa* denotes only the *saṅkhyēya* by injunction and not the *saṅkhyā*.

III

अथ उपदशाः इति कोऽयं समासः ?

To which *samāsa* does the word *upadaśāḥ* belong?

NOTE:—The word *upadaśāḥ* means those which are near *daśa* and *upa* means *sāmīpyavantaḥ* by *lakṣaṇā*.

बहुव्रीहिरित्याह "*Bahuvrīhi*," says he.

कोऽस्य विग्रहः ? What is its *vigraha*?

दशानां समीपे उपदशाः इति *Daśānām samīpē.*

कस्य पुनः सामीप्यमर्थः ? Whose meaning is *sāmīpya*?

NOTE :—*Sāmīpyam* means *sāmīpyavān.*

उपस्य Of *upa.*

यद्येवं, नान्यपदार्थो भवति

If so, the *samāsa* does not have *anyapadārthatva.*

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* writes that, if *saptamī* prominently refers to *samīpa*, the *samāsa* is *avyayībhāva* and if it refers to *samīpin*, it is *bahuvrīhi.*

IV

तत्र च प्रथमानिर्दिष्टं सङ्ख्याग्रहणं शक्यमकर्तुम्

Saṅkhyā read in the first case in the *sūtra* may be dropped.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *saṅkhyā* need not be read since *dvitrāḥ* etc. are *anyapadārthaka.*

मत्वर्थे वा पूर्वस्य विधानात

Or on account of the previous *sūtra* being enjoined with reference to *matvartha.*

अथवा मत्वर्थे पूर्वो योगः । अमत्वर्थेऽयमारम्भः

Or the previous *sūtra* is with reference to *matvartha* and this *sūtra* is with reference to *amatvarth ı.*

कप्प्रतिषेधार्थं वा Or for the sake of prohibiting *kap.*

अथ वा कप् मा भूद् इति Or it is intended to prohibit *kap.*

दिङ्नामान्यन्तराले (2, 2, 26)

तेन सहेति तुल्ययोगे (2, 2, 28)

Whether these two *sūtras* are necessary or not is discussed here.

दिक्समाससहयोगयोश्चान्तरालप्रधानाभिधानात्

No need to enjoin *bahuvrīhitva* with reference to *diksamāsa* and *sahayoga* on account of the *abhidhāna* of *antarāla* and *pradhāna* respectively.

दिक्समाससहयोगयोश्च अशिष्यो बहुव्रीहिः

Bahuvrīhi need not be enjoined with reference to *diksamāsa* and *sahayōga*.

NOTE :—*Sahayōga* refers to the *samāsa saputraḥ* and its *vigraha* is *sahēna yōgōssya*.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

अन्तरालप्रधानाभिधानात् । दिक्समासे सहयोगे च अन्तरालं प्रधानं च अभिधीयते. तत्र अन्यपदार्थ इत्येव सिद्धम्

On account of *antarālatva* and *pradhānatva* being expressed by them. *Antarālatva* is expressed in *diksamāsa* and *pradhānatva* in *sahayōga* and hence they are secured on the strength of *anyapadārthē*.

यद्येवं दक्षिणपूर्वा दिक्, समानाधिकरणलक्षणः पुंवद्भावो न प्राप्नोति । अद्य पुनरियं सैव दक्षिणा सैव पूर्वेति कृत्वा समानाधिकरणलक्षणः पुंवद्भावः सिद्धो भवति

If so, *puṁvadbhāva* in *dakṣiṇapūrvā* which is based on *sāmānādhikaraṇya* cannot be secured. If, on the other hand, this *sūtra* is read, *puṁvadbhāva* based on *sāmānādhikaraṇya* is secured by taking *dakṣiṇā* refer to south east which is near to it and by thus securing *sāmānādhikaraṇya*.

न सिध्यति । भाषितपुंस्कस्य पुंवद्भावो, न चैतौ भाषितपुंस्कौ

No, it is not accomplished. *Puṁvadbhāva* is enjoined only in the case of words which can be used to denote males also. These two are not *bhāṣitapuṁska*.

ननु च भोः दक्षिणशब्दः पूर्वशब्दश्च पुंसि भाष्येते

Oh, sir! the words *dakṣiṇā* and *pūrva* are used in the masculine gender.

समानायामाकृतौ यद्भाषितपुंस्कम् । आकृत्यन्तरे चैतौ भाषितपुंस्कौ । दक्षिणा पूर्वा इति दिक्शब्दौ, दक्षिणः पूर्व इति व्यवस्थाशब्दौ

Bhāṣitapuṁskatva refers to those which have the same *pravṛttinimitta*. The *pravṛttinimitta* of these two, being different, the *bhāṣitapuṁska* here is different from them. The words *dakṣiṇā* and *pūrvā* refer to directions (south and east) and the words

dakṣiṇa and *pūrva* refer to respective position (to the right, in front of).

यदि पुनर्दिक्शब्दा अपि व्यवस्थाशब्दाः स्युः

Suppose *dikśabdas* too are taken as *vyavasthāśabdas*.

कथं यानि दिगुपदिष्टानि कार्याणि ?

How is it then possible for the kāryas enjoined with reference to *dikśabdas* to operate with reference to these two words ?

यदा दिशो व्यवस्थां वक्ष्यन्ति

When they refer to the *vyavasthā* of direction.

यदि हि यो यो दिशि वर्तते स स दिक्शब्दः, रमणीयादिषु अतिप्रसङ्गो भवति – रमणीया दिक्, शोभना दिग् इति

If it is taken that whatever is in the direction is *dikśabda*, there is *atiprasaṅga* with reference to *ramaṇīya* etc. Cf *ramaṇīyā dik*, *śōbhanā dik*.

अथ मतमेतत् – दिशि दृष्टः दिग्दृष्टः, दिग्दृष्टः शब्दो दिक्शब्दः यो दिशं न व्यभिचरतीति न रमणीयादिषु अतिप्रसङ्गो भवति, पुंवद्भावस्तु न प्राप्नोति ।

Suppose it is taken thus :– *Dikśabdaḥ* is split into *digdṛṣṭaḥ śabdaḥ* and *digdṛṣṭaḥ* into *diśi dṛṣṭaḥ* (which means that is seen used to denote direction through *rūḍhi* or established usage). Then on the basis that it does not go beyond the denotation of *dik*, there may not be *atiprasaṅga* in *ramaṇīyā dik* etc. But there is no chance for *puṁvadbhāva*.

एवं तर्हि If so,

सर्वनाम्नो वृत्तिमात्रे पुंवद्भावो वक्तव्यो दक्षिणोत्तरपूर्वाणामित्येवमर्थम्

There is need to enjoin *puṁvadbhava* in *vṛtti* alone for *sarvanāman*, to secure the form *dakṣiṇa-uttara-pūrvāṇām*.

एवं च कृत्वास्तु 'दिक्समाससहयोगयोरन्तरालप्रधानाभिधानात् इत्येव

In that case let it be *Diksamāsasahayōgayōr antarālapradhānābhidhānāt*.

ननु चोक्तम् दक्षिणपूर्वा दिक्, समानाधिकरणलक्षणः पुंवद्भावो न प्राप्नोति

Oh, it was said that there will be no chance for *puṁvadbhāva* based on *sāmānādhikaraṇya* with reference to *dakṣiṇapūrvā dik*

नैष दोषः । सर्वनाम्नो वृत्तिमात्रे पुंवद्भावेन परिहृतः

This difficulty does not arise. It is solved by admitting *puṁvadbhāva* for *sarvanāmans* in *vṛtti* alone.

मत्वर्थे वा पूर्वस्य विधानात्

Or since the previous *sūtra* dealing with *matvartha*.

अथ वा मत्वर्थे पूर्वो योगः । अमत्वर्थार्थोऽयमारम्भः

Or the previous *sūtra* deals with *matvartha* and this *sūtra* with *amatvartha*.

कबभावार्थो वा Or for the sake of the absence of *kap*.

अथ वा कब् मा भूदिति Or, to prevent *kap*.

तत्र तेनेदमिति सरूपे (2, 2, 28)

तृतीयासप्तम्यन्तेषु च क्रियाभिधानादशिष्यो बहुव्रीहिः

Bahuvrīhi need not be enjoined since *kriyā* related to *tṛtīyanta* and *saptamyanta* is expressed.

तृतीयासप्तम्यन्तेषु चाशिष्यो बहुव्रीहिः

There is no need to enjoin *bahuvrīhi* with reference to *tṛtīyānta* and *saptamyanta*.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

क्रियाभिधानात् । क्रिया अभिधीयते । तत्र अन्यपदार्थे इत्येव सिद्धम् ।

On account of *kriyā* being expressed ; *kriyā* is expressed by *samāsa*. Hence *bahuvrīhi* is decidedly there on the strength of *anyapadārthē*.

न वैकशेषप्रतिषेधार्थम् No, it is necessary to prohibit *ēkaśēṣa*.

न वा अशिष्यः It cannot be said that it is unnecessary.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

एकशेषप्रतिषेधार्थमिदं वक्तव्यम्

This *sūtra* must be read to prohibit *ēkaśēṣa*.

पूर्वदीर्घार्थं च

For the sake of lengthening the final vowel of the former member also.

पूर्वदीर्घार्थं चेदं वक्तव्यम् - केशाकेशि

This *sūtra* must be read also to lengthen the final vowel of the former member, as in *kēśākēśi*.

स्यादेतत् प्रयोजनं यदि नियोगतोऽस्य अनेनैव दीर्घत्वं स्यात्; अथेदानीम् अन्येषामपि दृश्यते इति दीर्घत्वं, न प्रयोजनं भवति ।

There is possibility of this benefit if the lengthening of the former member is enjoined only by this *sūtra*; but if the *sūtra* *Anyēṣām api dṛśyatē* (6, 3, 137) enjoins it, this *sūtra* does not have that benefit.

मत्वर्थे वा पूर्वस्य विधानात्

Or since the previous *sūtra* is concerned with *matvartha*.

अथ वा मत्वर्थे पूर्वो योगः अमत्वर्थार्थोऽयमारम्भः

Or the previous *sūtra* operates where there is *matvartha* and this *sūtra* operates where there is no *matvartha*.

कबभावार्थं वा Or, for the sake of the absence of *kap*.

अथ वा कब् मा भूदिति Or, to prevent *kap*.

चार्थे द्वन्द्वः (2, 2, 29)

There are four topics here:—(1) Is *dvandva avyaya* or not? (2) Why do not the pairs *yāiñikaś cāyam Vāiyākaraṇaś ca* etc. form into a *dvandva* compound? (3) What are the relative advantages and disadvantages reaped by replacing the *sūtra* *Cārthē dvandvaḥ* by *Yugapad-adhikaraṇē dvandvaḥ*? (4) What is the nature of *samāsa* in *ēkādaśa* and *dvādaśa*?

I

चार्थे इत्युच्यते; चश्च अव्ययं तेन समासस्य अव्ययसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति

The expression *cārthē* is read in the *sūtra*; *ca* is evidently an *avyaya*; hence, (through similarity), *samāsa* may take *avyaya-saṁjñā*.

नैष दोषः । पाठेन अव्ययसंज्ञा क्रियते । न च द्वन्द्वः समासस्तत्र पठ्यते ।

No, this difficulty does not arise. *avyayasaṁjñā* is given to those that are read in the list in the *gaṇapāṭha*. *Dvandvasamāsa samāsa* is not read there.

पाठेनाप्यव्ययसंज्ञायां सत्यामभिधेयवल्लिङ्गवचनानि भविष्यन्ति । यश्चेहार्थोऽभिधीयते न तस्य लिङ्गसङ्ख्याभ्यां योगोऽस्ति ।

Granting that it gets *avyayasaṁjñā* even through *pāṭha*, the gender and the number should agree with those of the *pradhānārtha*. The *pradhānārtha* here is not connected with any gender or number.

NOTE :—*Nāgōjibhaṭṭa* says that this remark holds good only to *itarētarayōga-dvandva* and not to *samāhāra-dvandva*.

नेदं वाचनिकम् अलिङ्गता असङ्ख्यता च

It cannot be stated that the states of having no gender and no number exist at all periods.

किं तर्हि ? How then ?

स्वाभाविकमेतत्

It is but natural not to *possess* them at one stage and to possess them at another.

तद्यथा - समानमीहमानानां चाधीयानानां च केचिदर्थैर्युज्यन्ते अपरे न । न चेदानीं कश्चिदर्थवानिति कृत्वा सर्वैरर्थवद्भिः शक्यं भवितुं, कश्चिद्वानर्थक इति सर्वैरनर्थकैः । तत्र किमस्माभिः शक्यं कर्तुं, यत् प्राक् समासाच्चार्थस्य लिङ्गसङ्ख्याभ्यां योगो नास्ति, समासे च भवति । स्वाभाविकमेतत्

For instance, of those persons who study equally with the same hope (of getting money), some get it and others do not. Because one gets money, it need not be that all have got money, and because one has not got money, it need not be that all have not got money. What can be done by us there ? It is but natural for an expression denoting a meaning not to possess gender and number before it becomes a compound and to possess the same after it has become a compound.

अथ वा आश्रयतो लिङ्गवचनानि भविष्यन्ति - यथा गुणवचनेषु । गुणवचनानां हि शब्दानामाश्रयतो लिङ्गवचनानि भवन्ति । तद्यथा - शुक्लं वस्त्रं, शुक्ला शाटी शुक्लः कम्बलः, शुक्लौ कम्बलौ, शुक्लाः कम्बला इति । यदसौ द्रव्यं श्रितो भवति गुणः, तस्य यल्लिङ्गं वचनं च तद् गुणस्यापि भवति । एवमिहापि यदसौ द्रव्यं श्रितो भवति समासः, तस्य यल्लिङ्गं वचनं च तत् समासस्यापि भविष्यति ।

Or gender and number of a word are decided from those of the words that are qualified by them as in the case of words denoting quality. Words denoting quality take the gender and the number of the *guṇins* Viz. *śuklam vastram*, *śuklā śāṭī*, *śuklaḥ kambalaḥ*, *śuklāu kambalāu*, and *śuklāḥ kambalāḥ*. If the *guṇavācakaśabda* qualifies *guṇivācakaśabda*, the former takes the gender and the number of the latter. So also the *samāsa* takes the gender and the number of the word which denotes the *dravya* of which the *samāsārtha* serves as *viśēṣaṇa*.

II

अथेह कस्मान्न भवति याज्ञिकश्चायं वैयाकरणश्च, कठश्चायं बह्वृचश्च, औक्थिकश्चायं मीमांसकश्च इति ?

Which prevents the following pairs :- *Yājñikaś ca ayam Vāiyākaraṇaś ca ; Kaṭhaś ca ayam bahvṛcaś ca* and *Āukthikaś ca ayam mīmāṁsakaś ca* from forming into *dvandvasamāsa* ?

NOTE :— This question arises since the *dharmas* are different even though *dharmin* is the same, in the *paraṅkāryatva-pakṣa*. In the *ēka-saṁjñādhikārapakṣa* this does not arise on account of their being *tatpuruṣa* thro' *viśēṣavidhi*.

शेष इति वर्तते अशेषत्वान्न भविष्यति

There is *anuvṛtti* for the word *śēṣaḥ* (from the *sūtra Śēṣō bahu-vrīhiḥ*). *Dvandva* does not set in, since they do not come under the purview of *śēṣa* and (since they come under *Viśēṣaṇam viśēṣyēna bahulam*. 2-1-57).

यदि शेष इति वर्तते,

उपास्नातं स्थूलसिक्तं तूष्णीङ्गङ्गं महाह्रदम् ।
द्रोणं चेदशको गन्तुं मा त्वा ताप्सीं कृताकृते ॥

If there is *anuvṛtti* for *śēṣa*, the *dvandva kṛtākṛtē* in the verse

Upāsnātam sthūlasiktam tūṣṇīṅgaṅgam mahāhradam ।
Drōṇaṁ cēd aśakō gantum mā tvā tāptām kṛtākṛtē ॥

cannot be secured.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* reads :- *Atra "ktēna nañviśiṣṭēna anañ"* (2, 1, 60) *iti samāsavidhānād aśēṣatvād dvandvāprasaṅgaḥ*.

NOTE :— 2. *Kāiyaṭa* says that *upāsnāta* etc. are five *tīrthaviśēṣas*.

नैष दोषः; अन्यद्धि कृतम्, अन्यदकृतम्

This difficulty does not arise; for *kṛtam* is one and *akṛtam* is another (the former meaning *sukṛtam* or *puṇya* and the latter meaning *duṣkṛtam* or *pāpa*).

NOTE :— Since there need not be *sāmānādhikaraṇya* between *kṛta* and *akṛta*, they come under the purview of *śēṣa*.

III

चार्थे द्वन्द्ववचनेऽसमासेऽपि चार्थसम्प्रत्ययादनिष्टप्रसङ्गः

If the *sūtra* is read *Cārthē dvandvaḥ*, there is chance for the *saṁjñā* to reach in *asamāsa* where it is not needed, on account of the suggestion of *cārtha*.

चार्थे द्वन्द्ववचनेऽसमासेऽपि चार्थसम्प्रत्ययादनिष्टं प्राप्नोति

अहरहर्नयमानो गामश्वं पुरुषं पशुम् ।
वैवस्वतो न तृप्यति सुराया इव दुर्मदी ॥ इति

इन्द्रस्त्वष्टा वरुणो वायुरादित्य इति

Since the meaning of *ca* is suggested in the expression *gām aśvam puruṣam paśum* in the verse

Ahar-ahar nayamānō gām aśvām puruṣam paśum ।
Vāivasvatō na tṛpyati surāyā iva durmadī ॥

and in the expression *Indras tvaṣṭā varuṇō vāyur ādityaḥ*, there is chance for them to be designated *dvandvasamāsa* by the *sūtra Cārthē dvandvaḥ*, though it is not desired.

NOTE :—*Nāgōjibhaṭṭa* says that *lōkānām pālakāḥ* is understood after *ādityaḥ*.

सिद्धं तु युगपदधिकरणवचने [1] द्वन्द्ववचनात्

The object is achieved by replacing *Cārthē dvandvaḥ* by *Yugapadadhikaraṇavacanē dvandvaḥ*.

सिद्धमेतत् This (the object) is achieved.

1. *Yugapadadhikaraṇē* is another reading.

कथम् How?

[1] युगपदधिकरणवचने द्वन्द्वो भवतीति वक्तव्यम्

It must be enjoined that the designation *dvandva* is given only when each member of the compound conveys the meaning of the whole simultaneously.

तत्र पुंवद्भावप्रतिषेधः

There is need then for prohibiting *puṁvadbhāva*.

तत्रैतस्मिन्लक्षणे पुंवद्भावस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः, पट्वीमृद्व्यौ । समानाधिकरणलक्षणः पुंवद्भावः प्राप्नोति

If this *lakṣaṇa* is acceded to, there is need to prohibit *puṁvadbhāva*, to prevent it in the word *paṭvīmṛdvyāu*; otherwise, *puṁvadbhāva* based on *sāmānādhikaraṇya* may set in there.

विप्रतिषिद्धेषु चानुपपत्तिः

Impossibility of *dvandva* in words giving diametrically opposite meanings.

विप्रतिषिद्धेषु युगपदधिकरणवचनताया अनुपपत्तिः– शीतोष्णे, सुखदुःखे, जननमरणे

The reading - *Yugapad-adhikaraṇavacanē dvandvaḥ* will not suit in compound words made up of antonyms, as *śītōṣṇē*, *sukhaduḥkhē* and *jananamaraṇē*.

किं कारणम्? Why?

सुखप्रतिघातेन हि दुःखं, दुःखप्रतिघातेन च सुखम्

For *duḥkha* appears when *sukha* disappears and *sukha* appears when *duḥkha* disappears (and hence both cannot be *yugapad-adhikaraṇavācin*).

यत्तावदुच्यते तत्र पुंवद्भावप्रतिषेध इति, इदं तावदयं प्रष्टव्यः, अथेह पुंवद्भावः कस्मान्न भवति दर्शनीयाया माता दर्शनीयामाता इति । अथ मतमेतत्, प्राक् समासाद् यत्र सामानाधिकरण्यं तत्र पुंवद्भावो भवति इति, इहापि न दोषो भवति ।

Firstly with reference to the objection *Tatra puṁvadbhāva-pratiṣēdhaḥ*, he must be asked why *puṁvadbhāva* has not set

1. *Yugapad* = *ēkāikēna* (*Kāiyaṭa*).

in the word *darśanīyāmātā*, the compound of *darśanīyāyāḥ mātā*. If he answers that *puṁvadbhāva* sets in where there is *sāmānādhikaraṇya* before they become a *samāsa*, the same holds good here and hence the objection cannot stand.

यदप्युच्यते विप्रतिषिद्धेषु चानुपपत्तिरिति, सर्व एव हि शब्दा विप्रतिषिद्धाः । इहापि प्लक्षन्यग्रोधाविति, प्लक्षशब्दः प्रयुज्यमानः प्लक्षार्थं सम्प्रत्याययति, न्यग्रोधार्थं निवर्तयति । न्यग्रोधशब्दः प्रयुज्यमानो न्यग्रोधार्थं सम्प्रत्याययति प्लक्षार्थं निवर्तयति । अथात्र चेद्युक्ता युगपदधिकरणवचनता दृश्यते, इहापि युक्ता दृश्यताम् ।

With reference to the second objection *vipratiṣiddhēṣu cānupapattiḥ*, all words have meanings not related to one another. Even here in *plakṣa-nyagrōdhāu*, the word *plakṣa*, when used denotes *plakṣa* tree and makes *nyagrōdhārtha* recede. The word *nyagrōdha*, when used, denotes *nyagrōdha* tree and makes *plakṣārtha* recede. If it is considered, even then, that there is *yugapad-adhikaraṇavacanaiva*, the same exists here also (in *sukhaduḥkē* etc.)

एवमपि Even then,

शब्दपौर्वापर्यप्रयोगादर्थपौर्वापर्याभिधानम्

Connotation of the meaning in the order of the words used.

शब्दपौर्वापर्यप्रयोगाद् अर्थपौर्वापर्याभिधानं प्राप्नोति

Since words are used in a certain order, their meanings also may have to be conceived in the same order.

अतः किम् What if?

युगपदधिकरणवचनताया अनुपपत्तिः, [1] प्लक्षन्यग्रोधौ इति । यथैव हि शब्दानां पौर्वापर्यं तद्वदर्थानामपि भवितव्यम् ।

There will be impropriety in the *yugapad-adhikaraṇavacanatā* in the word *plakṣanyagrōdhāu*, since there must be sequence in the conception of meaning in the same way as there is sequence in the use of words.

शब्दपौर्वापर्यप्रयोगाद् अर्थपौर्वापर्याभिधानमिति चेद् द्विवचनबहुवचनानुपपत्तिः

1 *Plakṣanyagrōdhāu, plakṣanyagrōdhāḥ* is another reading.

If it is said that *śabdapāurvāparyaprayōga* leads to *artha-pāurvāparyābhidhāna*, there is no chance for *dvivacana* and *bahuvacana*.

शब्दपौर्वापर्यप्रयोयोगाद् अर्थपौर्वापर्याभिधानमिति चेद् द्विवचनबहुवचनयोरनुपपत्तिः प्लक्षन्यग्रोधौ प्लक्षन्यग्रोधा इति । प्लक्षशब्दः सार्थको निवृत्तो न्यग्रोधशब्द उपस्थितः । एक एकार्थः तस्यैकार्थत्वाद् एकवचनं प्राप्नोति ।

If it is admitted that there is sequence in the conception of the meaning of the component parts of a compound on account of the sequence of the component parts of the compound, the use of dual and plural numbers will become inappropriate in the words *plakṣa-nyagrōdhāu* and *plakṣanyagrōdhāḥ*. Since the word *nyagrōdha* comes in after the word *plakṣa* has receded with its meaning and since *ēkavacana* is to be used to denote one object and *nyagrōdha* denotes only one object, only the singular suffix has a chance to be used after *nyagrōdha*.

विग्रहे च युगपद्वचनं ज्ञापकं युगपद्वचनस्य

Yugapadvacana in *non-samāsa* is *jñāpaka* to *yugapadvacana* in *samāsa*.

विग्रहे खल्वपि युगपद्वचनता दृश्यते - द्यावा ह क्षामा (R. V. 10, 12, 1) द्यावा चिदस्मै पृथिवी नमेते[1] (R. V. 2, 12, 13) इति

Yugapadvacanatā is seen even in *non-samāsa* words as in *dyāvā* and *kṣāmā* and as in *dyāvā* and *pṛthivī* in *Dyāvā cid asmāi*.

NOTE :—1. The words *dyāvā*, *kṣāmā*, and *pṛthivī* are dual in number. Unless *dyāvā* in the first and the second, example refers to both *dyāuḥ* and *kṣāmā* and *dyāuḥ* and *pṛthivī* respectively, the dual number after it cannot be satisfactorily explained. Similarly *kṣāmā* and *pṛthivī* refer to both *dyāuḥ* and *kṣāmā* aad *dyāuḥ* and *pṛthivī*.

NOTE :— 2. *Dyāvā* and *kṣāmā* are the members of split compound current in *Vēdic* Sanskrit.

1. *Saṁnamētē* is another reading.

किमेतत्? What is the use of this?

युगपदधिकरणवचनताया उपोद्बलकम् । विग्रहे किल नाम युगपदधिकरणवचनता स्यात्, किं पुनः समासे?

It lends support to *yugapad-adhikaraṇa-vacanatva*. When *yugapad-adhikaraṇavacanatā* is found even in non-compounds, what objection can there be to hold it in the compound?

समुदायात्सिद्धम्

It (the use of the dual and the plural) is achieved through *samudāya* (whole) being denoted by *dvandva*.

समुदायात्सिद्धमेतत्

This is achieved through *samudāya* being denoted by *dvandva*.

किमेतत् समुदायात् सिद्धम् इति?

What purpose is served by the statement *samudāyāt siddham*?

द्विवचनबहुवचनताप्रसिद्धिरिति चोदितं, तस्यायं परिहारः

This serves as the answer to the objection raised that there will be no chance for dual suffix and plural suffix (in *plakṣa-nyagrōdhāu* and *plakṣa-nygrōdhāḥ*).

समुदायात्सिद्धमिति चेन्न, एकार्थत्वात्समुदायस्य

The answer *samudāyāt siddham* cannot hold good, since *samudāya* comprehends oneness.

समुदायात् सिद्धमिति चेत्, तन्न

The answer *samudāyāt siddham* cannot hold good.

किं कारणम्? Why?

एकार्थत्वात् समुदायस्य । एकार्था हि समुदाया भवन्ति । तद्यथा शतं, यूथं वनम् इति

Since *samudāya* comprehends oneness. For *samudāyās* are taken collectively. Viz. *śatam, yūtham* and *vanam*.

नैकार्थ्यम् There is no *ēkārthatā*.

नायमेकार्थः It has no collective sense.

किं तर्हि? What then?

द्व्यर्थो बह्वर्थश्च They denote two and many.

प्लक्षोऽपि द्व्यर्थो न्यग्रोधोऽपि द्व्यर्थः

Plakṣa comprehends two objects and *nyagrōdha* too comprehends two.

यदि तर्हि प्लक्षोऽपि द्व्यर्थः, न्यग्रोधोऽपि द्व्यर्थः

If, then, it is held that *plakṣa* denotes two objects and *nyagrōdha* too denotes two objects.

तयोरनेकार्थत्वाद् बहुषु बहुवचनप्रसङ्गः

There is chance for the plural suffix, on account of both of them together denoting many.

तयोरनेकार्थत्वाद् बहुषु बहुवचनम् इति बहुवचनं प्राप्नोति

Since both of them together denote many, plural suffix may set in by the *sūtra Bahuṣu bahuvacanam.*

तयोरनेकार्थत्वाद् बहुवचनप्रसङ्ग इति चेन्न बहुत्वाभावात्

There is no chance for plural suffix on the assumption of their denoting many, since there is no *bahutva.*

तयोरनेकार्थत्वाद् बहुवचनप्रसङ्ग इति चेन्न

It is not right to argue that plural suffix may set in since they denote many.

किं कारणम्? Why?

बहुत्वाभावात् । नात्र बहुत्वमस्ति

On account of the absence of *bahutva*. There is no *bahutva* here.

किमुच्यते बहुत्वाभावादिति, यदा इदानीमेवोक्तं प्लक्षोऽपि द्व्यर्थो न्यग्रोधोऽपि द्व्यर्थ इति ?

Is the statement *bahutvābhāvāt* appropriate when it is just now said that *plakṣa* is *dvyartha* and *nyagrōdha* too is *dvyartha*?

याभ्यामेवात्रैको द्व्यर्थः, ताभ्यामेवापरोऽपि

One denotes exactly the same two objects as are denoted by the other; hence the objects denoted are only two (and not four).

यद्येवम् If so,

अन्यवाचकेनान्यस्य वचनानुपपत्तिः

Impossibility of one word denoting the meaning of another,

अन्यवाचकेन शब्देनान्यस्य वचनं नोपपद्यते

It is not fit for a word with one denotation to have that of another.

अन्यवाचकेनान्यस्य वचनानुपपत्तिरिति चेत् प्लक्षस्य न्यग्रोधत्वाद् न्यग्रोधस्य प्लक्षत्वात् स्वशब्देनाभिधानम्

If it is said that it is inappropriate for one object to be denoted by a word which denotes another, it is met by saying that the object is denoted only by the word which has that meaning, since *plakṣa* is *nyagrōdha* and *nyagrōdha* is *plakṣa.*

अन्यवाचकेन अन्यस्य वचनानुपपत्तिरिति चेद् एवमुच्यते तन्न ।

If it is said that it is inappropriate for one object to be denoted by a word whose meaning is different, it is answered that it is not so.

किं कारणम्? Why?

प्लक्षस्य न्यग्रोधत्वाद् न्यग्रोधस्य च प्लक्षत्वाच्च स्वशब्देन अभिधानं भविष्यति । प्लक्षोऽपि न्यग्रोधः, न्यग्रोधोऽपि प्लक्षः

There is *abhidhāna* by *svaśabda,* since *plakṣa* is *nyagrōdha* and *nyagrōdha* is *plakṣa.* The word *plakṣa* denotes *nyagrōdha* too and the word *nyagrōdha* denotes *plakṣa* too.

कथं पुनः प्लक्षोऽपि न्यग्रोधो न्यग्रोधोऽपि प्लक्षः स्याद् यावता कारणाद् द्रव्ये शब्दनिवेशः?

How is it possible for *plakṣa* to denote *nyagrōdha* too and *nyagrōdha* to denote *plakṣa* too, since words are used to denote objects on some basis.

कारणाद् द्रव्ये शब्दनिवेश इति चेत् तुल्यकारणत्वात् सिद्धम्

If it is said that the use of *śabda* to denote *dravya* is through some *kāraṇa,* the object is achieved here since the same *kāraṇa* exists in both.

कारणाद् द्रव्ये शब्दनिवेश इति चेदेवमुच्यते, तन्न

If it is said so on the basis that the use of a *śabda* to denote a particular *dravya* is determined by some *kāraṇa*, it is not so.

तुल्यकारणत्वात् सिद्धम् । तुल्यं हि कारणम् । यदि तावत् प्रक्षरतीति प्लक्षः स्यात्, न्यग्रोधेऽप्येतद् भवति । तथा यदि न्यग् रोहतीति न्यग्रोधः, प्लक्षेऽप्येतद् भवति ।

The object is achieved, since the same *kārana* exists in both. For *kāraṇa* is the same. If the *pravṛttinimitta* of *plakṣa* is *prakṣaraṇatva* (the state of extending wide), the same holds good to *nyagrōdha* too. If that of *nyagrōdha* is *nyag-rōhaṇatva* (the state of throwing off-shoots downward), the same holds good for *plakṣa* too.

दर्शनं वै हेतुः The usage is the *kāraṇa*.

न च न्यग्रोधे प्लक्षशब्दो दृश्यते

The word *plakṣa* is not used to denote *nyagrōdha*.

दर्शनं हेतुरिति चेत्तुल्यम्

If usage is taken to be the *kāraṇa*, it is the same.

दर्शनं हेतुरिति चेत् तुल्यमेतद् भवति । प्लक्षेऽपि न्यग्रोधशब्दो दृश्यते, न्यग्रोधेऽपि प्लक्षशब्दः । तुल्यं हि कारणम् ।

If usage is taken to be the *hētu*, their denotation is the same. *Nyagrōdha* is used to denote *plakṣa* and *plakṣa* to denote *nyagrōdha*; for the *hētu* of denotation remains the same.

न वै लोके एष सम्प्रत्ययो भवति । न हि प्लक्ष आनीयतामित्युक्ते न्यग्रोध आनीयते

It is not so taken in the world; for if one says, "Bring *plakṣa*", *nyagrōdha* is not brought.

तद्विषयं च (One denoting another) is found only in it (*dvandva*).

तद्विषयं चेतद् द्रष्टव्यं प्लक्षस्य न्यग्रोधत्वम्

It must be comprehended that *plakṣa* denotes *nyagrōdha* in it alone.

किंविषयम्? In which alone?

द्वन्द्वविषयम् In *dvandva* alone.

युक्तं पुनर्यन्नियतविषया नाम शब्दाः स्युः?
Is it proper to take that words are restricted in their usage?

बाढं युक्तम् It is certainly proper.

अन्यत्रापि तद्विषयदर्शनात्
On account of *niyata-viṣayatva* (restricted application) being seen elsewhere too.

अन्यत्रापि हि नियतविषयाः शब्दा दृश्यन्ते । तद्यथा - समाने रक्ते वर्णे, गौर्लोहित इति भवति, अश्वः शोण इति; समाने च काले वर्णे, गौः कृष्ण इति भवति, अश्वो हेम इति; समाने च शुक्ले वर्णे, गौः श्वेत इति भवति, अश्वः कर्क इति।
Words have restricted application elsewhere too. It is illustrated thus:- Though red colour is one, the word *ōhita* is used with reference to the bull, and the word *śōṇa*, with reference to the horse; though black colour is one, the word *kṛṣṇa* is used with reference to the bull and the word *hēma* with reference to the horse; and even though white colour is one, the word *śvēta* is used with reference to the bull and word *karka* with reference to the horse.

यदि तर्हि प्लक्षोऽपि न्यग्रोधः, न्यग्रोधोऽपि प्लक्षः,
If, then, it is taken that *plakṣa* denotes *nyagrōdha* too and *vice-versa*,

एकेनोक्तत्वादपरस्य प्रयोगोऽनुपपन्नः
The use of another is inappropriate on account of its meaning being expressed by one.

एकेनोक्तत्वात्तस्यार्थस्य अपरस्य प्रयोगो नोपपद्यते, प्लक्षेण न्यग्रोधस्य, न्यग्रोध-प्रयोगः
Since one expresses the meaning of another, the use of the second is inappropriate. If the meaning of *nyagrōdha* is expressed by *plakṣa*, the use of *nyagrōdha* is unnecessary.

एकेनोक्तत्वादपरस्य प्रयोगोऽनुपपन्न इति चेदनुक्तत्वात् प्लक्षेण न्यग्रोधस्य न्यग्रोधप्रयोगः

If it is said that the use of the second is not necessary on account of its meaning being expressed by the first, there is need for the use of *nyagrōdha*, since its meaning has not been expressed by *plakṣa*.

एकेनोक्तत्वाद् अपरस्य प्रयोगोऽनुपपन्न इति चेत्, तन्न ।

It is not right to say that the second need not be used, since its meaning has been expressed by the first.

किं कारणम्? Why?

अनुक्तत्वात् प्लक्षेण न्यग्रोधस्य न्यग्रोधप्रयोगः - अनुक्तः प्लक्षेण न्यग्रोधार्थ इति कृत्वा न्यग्रोधशब्दः प्रयुज्यते

The use of *nyagrōdha* on account of *nyagrōdha* not being denoted by *plakṣa*. *Nyagrōdha* is read on the understanding that its meaning has not been denoted by *plakṣa*.

कथमनुक्तः, यावतेदानीमेवोक्तं प्लक्षोऽपि न्यग्रोधः, न्यग्रोधोऽपि प्लक्ष इति ?

How is it that its meaning has not been expressed by *plakṣa*, even though it has just now been said that *plakṣa* is *nyagrōdha* and *nyagrōdha* is *plakṣa*?

सहभूतावेतौ अन्योऽन्यस्यार्थमाहतुः, न पृथग्भूतौ ?

Only when they are knit together as in *dvandva*, one can denote another and *vice versa* and not when they are separated from each other.

किं पुनः कारणं सहभूतावेतौ अन्योन्यस्यार्थमाहतुः, न पृथग्भूतौ ?

What is the authority to determine that one denotes the other too only when they are knit together and not when they are separated from each other?

अभिधानं पुनः स्वाभाविकम् The denotion is inherent in them.

स्वाभाविकमभिधानम्

It is in their very nature to have such a denotation.

अथ वा इह कौ चित् प्राथमकल्पिकौ प्लक्षन्यग्रोधौ, कौ चित् क्रियया वा गुणेन वा प्लक्ष इवायं प्लक्षः न्यग्रोध इवायं न्यग्रोध इति । तत्र प्लक्षौ इति उक्ते सन्देहः स्यात् - किमिवौ प्लक्षावेव आहोस्वित् प्लक्षन्यग्रोधौ इति । तत्र असन्देहार्थं न्यग्रोधशब्दः प्रयुज्यते ।

Or the words *plakṣa* and *nyagrōdha* have firstly their *primary* sense and then *secondary* sense on the basis of similarity in *kriyā* or *guṇa*. If the word *plakṣāu* is read, the doubt whether it denotes two *plakṣas* or a *plakṣa* and a *nyagrōdha* may arise. In order to clear the doubt the word *nyagrōdha* is read (along with *plakṣa*).

सेयं युगपदधिकरणवचनता नाम दुःखा च दुरुपपादा च । यच्चाप्यस्या निबन्धनमुक्तं द्यावा ह क्षामा इति, तदपि छान्दसम् । तत्र सुपां सुपो भवन्तीत्येव सिद्धम् । सूत्रं च भिद्यते ।

This *Yugapad-adhikaraṇa-vacanatā* is beset with difficulties and is not supported with *pramāṇa*. The point stated in support of it—*dyāvā ha kṣāmā* is *Vēdic* expression. The use of one case-suffix for another there may be on the strength of the *sūtra Supām suluk*...(7, 1, 39). Besides the *sūtra* has to be reworded.

यथान्यासमेवास्तु Let the *sūtra* be as it is.

ननु चोक्तं चार्थे द्वन्द्ववचने असमासेऽपि चार्थसम्प्रत्ययादनिष्टप्रसङ्गः इति ।

Oh, it was said that the reading *Cārthē dvandvaḥ* will land us in difficulties, since *cārtha* is found in *non-samāsas* too.

नैष दोषः । इह चे द्वन्द्वः इतीयता सिद्धम्

This difficulty does not arise. The purpose is served by reading the *sūtra Cē dvandvaḥ*.

कथं पुनश्चे नाम वृत्तिः स्यात्, शब्दो ह्येषः ?

How is it possible for *vṛtti* to exist in *ca*, it being only *śabda*

शब्दे कार्यासम्भवाद् अर्थे कार्यं विज्ञास्यते

Since it is not possible to have *kārya* in *śabda*, it is taken that it takes place in *artha*.

सोऽयमेवं सिद्धे सति यदर्थग्रहणं करोति तस्यैतत् प्रयोजनम् - एवं यथा विज्ञायेत - चेन कृतोऽर्थः चार्थः इति

When the object is capable of being thus achieved even without *artha*, the benefit of its reading is this-that the word *cārtha* should be split as *cēna kr̥taḥ arthaḥ* so that it may mean the *artha expressed* by *ca* alone (and not *suggested*).

कः पुनश्चेन कृतोऽर्थः What is the *artha* conveyed by *ca.*

समुच्चयोऽन्वाचय इतरेतरयोगः समाहार इति

Samuccaya, *anvācaya*, *itarētarayōga* and *samāhāra*.

[1] समुच्चयः - प्लक्षश्च इत्युक्ते, गम्यते एतद् न्यग्रोधश्च इति ; तथा न्यग्रोधश्च इत्युक्ते, गम्यते एतत् प्लक्षश्च इति ।

Samuccaya (aggregation). If *plakṣaś ca* is read, *nyagrōdhaś ca* is suggested and if *nyagrōdhaś ca* is read, *plakṣaś ca* is suggested.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *plakṣaś ca* suggests *nyagrōdhśa ca* if it is read after *Nyagrōdhō dr̥śyatām.*

अन्वाचयः - प्लक्षश्च इत्युक्ते गम्यते एतत्, सापेक्षोऽयं प्रयुज्यते इति ।

Anvācaya (Associating a subordinate one with the principal) :- If *plakṣaś ca* is read, it suggests that something else is associated with it.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that there is no *dvandva* between a word denoting *pradhānu* and another denoting an object associated with it.

इतरेतरयोगः - प्लक्षश्च न्यग्रोधश्च इत्युक्ते गम्यते एतत्, प्लक्षोऽपि न्यग्रोधसहायः, न्यग्रोधोऽपि प्लक्षसहाय इति

Itarētarayōgaḥ (Mutual association). If *plakṣaś ca nyagrōdhaś ca* is read, it is suggested that *plakṣa* is in association with *nyagrōda* and *nyagrōdha* too is in association with *plakṣa.*

1. *Samuccay'* etc is another reading.

प्लक्षश्च न्यग्रोधश्च इत्युक्ते समाहारेऽपि क्रियते प्लक्षन्यग्रोधम् इति । तत्रायप्यर्थः - द्वन्द्वैकवद्भावो न पठितव्यो भवति, समाहारैकत्वादेव सिद्धम् ।

When *plakṣaś ca nyagrōdhaś ca* is read, they are combined into *samāhāradvandva* thus:- *plakṣanyagrōdham.* This too becomes the *prayōjana* that *dvandvāikavadbhāva* need not be enjoined in the *sūtras Dvandvaś ca....* (2, 4, 2) etc, since its purpose is served by *samāhāradvandva.*

NOTE :—*Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* says that *ca* is *dyōtaka* in *samuccaya* and *anvācaya* and *vācaka* in the other two.

IV

एकादश द्वादश इति कोऽयं समासः

To which *samāsa* do *ēkādaśa* and *dvādaśa* belong?

एकादीनां दशादिभिर्द्वन्द्वः

Dvandva between *ēka* etc. and *daśa* etc.

एकादीनां सह दशादिभिर्द्वन्द्वः समासः

Dvandva is the *samāsa* between *ēka* etc. and *daśa* etc.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *ādi* refers to *viṁśati* etc.

एकादीनां दशादिभिर्द्वन्द्व इति चेद् विंशत्यादिषु वचनप्रसङ्गः

On admitting *dvandva* between *ēka* etc. and *daśa* etc. there is chance for dual and plural suffixes after *viṁśati* etc.

एकादीनां दशादिभिर्द्वन्द्व इति चेद् विंशत्यादिषु वचनं प्राप्नोति एकविंशतिः, द्वाविंशतिः

If it is admitted that there is *dvandva* between *ēka* etc. and *daśa* etc. dual and plural suffixes may appear after *viṁśati* in *ēkaviṁśatiḥ, dvāviṁśatiḥ.*

सिद्धं त्वधिकान्ता सङ्ख्या सङ्ख्यया समानाधिकरणाधिकारेऽधिकलोपश्च

The object is achieved by reading in *samānādhikaraṇādhikāra* : *Adhikāntā saṅkhyā saṅkhyayā adhikalōpaś ca.*

सिद्धमेतत् The object is achieved.

कथम् ! How ?

समानाधिकरणाधिकारे वक्तव्यम् - अधिकान्ता सङ्ख्या सङ्ख्यया च सह समस्यते अधिकशब्दस्य च लोपो भवति इति । एकाधिका विंशतिः एकविंशतिः, द्व्यधिका विंशतिः द्वाविंशतिः ।

The following has to be read in *samānādhikaraṇādhikāra* :- *Adhikāntā saṅkhyā saṅkhyayā saha samasyatē adhikaśabdasya ca lōpō bhavati,* (a number followed by *adhika* compounds with another number and the word *adhika* is dropped) so that *ēkaviṁśatiḥ* and *dvāviṁśatiḥ* may have the *vigraha ēkādhikā viṁśatiḥ* and *dvyadhikā viṁśatiḥ*.

यदि समानाधिकरणः, स्वरो न सिद्ध्यति । यद्धि तत् 'सङ्ख्या पूर्वपदं प्रकृतिस्वरं भवति' इति, द्वन्द्वे इत्येवं तत् ।

If it is read in the *samānādhikaraṇādhikāra,* the *udātta* cannot appear at the desired place. The rule that the *saṅkhyā* takes *pūrvapadaprakṛtisvam* will operate in *dvandva.*

किं पुनः कारणं द्वन्द्व इत्येवं तत्

Why should it be taken to operate in *dvandva* ?

इह मा भूत् शतसहस्रम्

To prevent the same in *Śatasahasram* (the compound of *sahasrāṇām* and *śatam*).

अस्तु तर्हि द्वन्द्वः Let it then be *dvandva* in *ēkādaśa* etc.

ननु चोक्तम् एकादीनां दशादिभिर्द्वन्द्व इति चेत् विंशत्यादिषु वचनप्रसङ्ग इति

Oh, the following :- *Ekādīnām daśādibhir dvandva iti cēd viṁśatyādiṣu vacanaprasaṅgaḥ* was raised against it.

नैष दोषः । सर्वो हि द्वन्द्वो विभाषैकवद् भवति

This difficulty does not arise. All *dvandvas* can be optionally treated like singular nouns.

यदा तर्हि एकवचनं तदा नपुंसकलिङ्गं प्राप्नोति

If singular appears, neuter suffix may set in.

लिङ्गमशिष्यं लोकाश्रयत्वाल्लिङ्गस्य

Liṅga need not be enjoined since it follows the usage in the world.

उपसर्जनं पूर्वम् (2, 2, 30)

किमर्थमिदमुच्यते ? Why is this read ?

उपसर्जनस्य पूर्ववचनं परप्रयोगनिवृत्त्यर्थम्
Reading of *Upasarjanam pūrvam* is to prohibit *paraprayōga.*

उपसर्जनस्य पूर्ववचनं क्रियते, परप्रयोगो मा भूदिति
Pūrvavacana to *upasarjana* is enjoined to prevent it from being the latter member of a compound.

न वानिष्टादर्शनात्
It need not be since there is no *prayōga* contrary to it.

न वा एतत्प्रयोजनमस्ति This is not the real benefit.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

अनिष्टादर्शनात् । न हि किञ्चिदनिष्टं दृश्यते । न हि कश्चित् राजपुरुष इति प्रयोक्तव्ये पुरुषराज इति प्रयुङ्क्ते । यदि चानिष्टं प्रसज्येत ततो यत्नार्हं स्यात् ।
On account of the absence of undesired element. For nothing that we do not wish for is seen here. None uses the word *puruṣarāja* in place of *rājapuruṣa*. Attempt is necessary only when there is a chance for *aniṣṭa*.

NOTE :—*Vārttikakāra* feels that this *sūtra* need not be read, since Grammar has to deal with only the forms current in the world.

अथ यत्र द्वे षष्ठ्यन्ते भवतः कस्मात् तत्र प्रधानस्य पूर्वनिपातो न भवति, राज्ञः पुरुषस्य राजपुरुषस्य इति ?
Why is there no *pūrvanipāta* to the *pradhana* when there are two nouns in the sixth case, as *rājñaḥ puruṣasya* ? We have only *rājapurṣasya.*

NOTE :—This question arises on the assumption that both form a compound by *Ṣaṣṭhī* (2, 2, 8) which is in the nominative case.

षष्ठ्यन्तयोः समासेऽर्थभेदात् प्रधानस्यापूर्वनिपातः
There is no *pūrvanipāta* to the *pradhāna* in the *samāsa* between two *ṣaṣṭhyanta's*, since both denote the same.

षष्ठ्यन्तयोः समासे अर्थभेदात् प्रधानस्य पूर्वनिपातो न भविष्यति

There is no *pūrvanipāta* to the *pradhāna* in the *samāsa* between two *ṣaṣṭhyanta's* since both denote the same.

NOTE:—The objector takes *rājapuruṣasya* as the sixth case of *rājapuruṣa*,- the compound of *rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ*, while the *siddhāntin* takes it only as the compound of *rājā cāsāu puruṣaś ca.*

एवं न चेदमकृतं भवति उपसर्जनं पूर्वमिति

Hence is this *sūtra* read *Upasarjanam pūrvam.*

अर्थश्च अभिन्न इति कृत्वा प्रधानस्य पूर्वनिपातो न भविष्यति ।

There is no *pūrvanipāta* to the *pradhāna* on account of their meanings having the *sambandha* of *abhēdatā* and not *pradhānāp-radhānatā*.

अल्पाच्तरम् (2, 2, 34)

किमयं तन्त्रं तरनिर्देशः, आहोस्विद् अतन्त्रम् ?

Is the suffix *tara* read here to denote comparative degree enjoined in *Dvivacana*.... (5, 3, 57) or for euphony ?

किं चातः ? What does it matter if it is either ?

यदि तन्त्रं द्वयोर्नियमो बहुषु अनियमः

If it is *tantra*, *niyama-sūtra* will apply only when the compound has two components and not more than two.

तत्र को दोषः ? What harm is there ?

शङ्खदुन्दुभिवीणानाम् इति न सिध्यति । दुन्दुभिशब्दस्यादि पूर्वनिपातः प्राप्नोति ।

The form *Śaṅkha-dundubhi-vīṇānām* (with *śankha* as the first member) cannot be secured. There is chance for *dundubhi* also to be used as the first member.

अथ अतन्त्रं, मृदङ्गशङ्खतूणवाः पृथङ्नदन्ति संसदि, प्रासादे धनपतिराम-केशवानाम् इत्येतन्न सिध्यति ।

If it is *atantra*, the forms *mṛdaṅga-śaṅkha-tūṇavāḥ* and *dhana-pati-rāma-kēśavānām* in *mṛdaṅga-śaṅkhatūṇavāḥ pṛthaṅ nadanti*

saṁsadi and in *Prāsādē dhanapati-rāma-kēśavānām* cannot be secured (since *śaṅkha* and *Rāma* which are *alpāc* may be used as first members).

यथेच्छसि तथास्तु Let it be as you please.

अस्तु तावत् तन्त्रम् Let it be *tantra*.

ननु चोक्तं द्वयोर्नियमः बहुष्वनियम इति । तत्र शङ्खदुन्दुभिवीणानाम् इति न सिध्यति । दुन्दुभिशब्दस्यापि पूर्वनिपातः प्राप्नोतीति

Oh, it was said *Dvayōr niyamaḥ bahuṣu aniyamaḥ* and the form *śankhadundubhivīṇānām* cannot be secured and there may be *pūrvanipāta* to *dundubhi* also.

नैष दोषः । यदेतदल्पाच्तरमिति तदल्पाजिति वक्ष्यामि ।

This difficulty does not arise. I shall replace *alpāctaram* by *alpāc.*

अथ वा पुनरस्त्वतन्त्रम् Or let it be *atantra*.

ननु चोक्तं मृदङ्गशङ्खतूणवाः पृथङ् नदन्ति संसदि, प्रासादे धनपतिरामकेशवानाम् इत्येतन्न सिध्यति इति

Oh, it was said that *mṛdaṅga-śaṅkha-tūṇavāḥ* and *dhanapati-rāmakēśavānām* in the expressions *Mṛdaṅga-śankha-tūṇavāḥ pṛthaṅ nandanti saṁsadi, Prāsādē dhanapati-rāma-kēśavānām* cannot be secured.

अतन्त्रे तरनिर्देशे शङ्खतूणवयोर्मृदङ्गेन समासः

When *tara* is *atantra*, *śaṅkhatūṇavāu* forms *samāsa* with *mṛdaṅga*.

अतन्त्रे तरनिर्देशे शङ्खतूणवयोर्मृदङ्गेन सह समासः करिष्यते - शङ्खश्च तूणवश्च शङ्खतूणवौ ; मृदङ्गश्च शङ्खतूणवौ [1] च मृदङ्गशङ्खतूणवाः । रामश्च केशवश्च रामकेशवौ ; धनपतिश्च रामकेशवौ च धनपतिरामकेशवाः, धनपतिरामकेशवानाम् इति ।

If *tara* is not taken as comparative suffix, *śaṅkha-tūṇavāu* compounds with *mṛdaṅga* thus :- *Śaṅkhaś ca tūṇavaś ca*

1. Some editions invert the order.

śaṅkha-tūṇavāu ; mṛdaṅgaś ca śaṅkhatūṇavāu ca mṛdaṅgaśaṅkha-tūṇavāḥ. Similarly *Rāmaś ca Kēśavaś ca, Rāmakēśavāu Dhanapatiś ca Rāmakēśavāu ca, Dhanapatirāmakēśavāḥ, Dhanapatirāmakēśavānām.*

अथ यत्र बहूनां पूर्वनिपातप्रसङ्गः किं तत्रैकस्य नियमो भवति, आहोस्वित् अविशेषेण

When there is a chance for many words to have *pūrva-nipāta,* does it hold good for one or for all ?

अनेकप्राप्तावेकस्य नियमोऽनियमः शेषेषु

When there is a chance for many, there is *niyama* for one and *aniyama* for others.

अनेकस्य प्राप्तौ एकस्य नियमो भवति, शेषेष्वनियमः - पटुमृदुशुक्लाः, पटुशुक्लमृदव इति

When there is a chance for many, there is *niyama* for one and *aniyama* for the rest *viz Paṭu-mṛdu-śuklāḥ* and *paṭu-sukla-mṛdavaḥ.*

ऋतुनक्षत्राणामानुपूर्व्येण समानाक्षराणाम्

In their order in the case of *ṛtus* and *nakṣatras* of equal syllables.

ऋतुनक्षत्राणामानुपूर्व्येण समानाक्षराणां पूर्वनिपातो वक्तव्यः - शिशिरवसन्तौ उदगयनस्थौ, कृत्तिकारोहिण्यः

Pūrvanipāta, in their order, must be enjoined with respect to words denoting seasons and constellations having the same number of syllables. Viz *śiśiravasantāu, udagayanasthāu* and *kṛttikā-rōhiṇyaḥ.*

अभ्यर्हितम् *Pūrvanipāta* of the more respected.

अभ्यर्हितं च पूर्वं निपततीति वक्तव्यम् - मातापितरौ, श्रद्धामेधे

It must be enjoined that the more respected get the *pūrva-nipāta.* Viz *Mātāpitarāu* and *śraddhāmēdhē.*

लघ्वक्षरम् Word having a short vowel.

लघ्वक्षरं पूर्वं निपततीति वक्तव्यम् - कुशकाशम्, शरचापम् ।

It must be enjoined that *laghvakṣara* has the *pūrvanipāta*. Viz. *kuśakāśam* and *śaracāpam*.

अपर आह - सर्वत एव अभ्यर्हितं पूर्वं निपततीति वक्तव्यम् - लघ्वक्षरादपि श्रद्धातपसी, दीक्षातपसी

Another says that the more respected deserves *pūrvanipāta* everywhere, even in preference to *laghvakṣara*. Viz. *śraddhā-tapasī* and *dīkṣātapasī*.

वर्णानामानुपूर्व्येण In their order with respect to castes.

वर्णानाञ्च आनुपूर्व्येण पूर्वनिपाता भवन्तीति वक्तव्यम् - ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियविट्शूद्राः

Pūrvanipāta must be enjoined in their order with respect to castes. Viz *Brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya-viṭ-śūdrāḥ*.

भ्रातुश्च ज्यायसः To the elder between brothers.

भ्रातुश्च ज्यायसः पूर्वनिपातो भवतीति वक्तव्यम् - युधिष्ठिरार्जुनौ

Pūrvanipāta must be enjoined to the elder between brothers Viz. *Yudhiṣṭhira-arjunāu*.

सङ्ख्याया अल्पीयसः To the smaller between numbers.

सङ्ख्याया अल्पीयसः पूर्वनिपातो भवतीति वक्तव्यम् - एकादश, द्वादश

It must be enjoined that the smaller between numbers gets the *pūrvanipāta*. Viz. *Ekādaśa* and *dvādaśa*.

धर्मादिषूभयम् Both among *dharma* etc.

धर्मादिषु उभयं पूर्व निपततीति वक्तव्यम् - धर्मार्थौ, अर्थधर्मौ ; कामार्थौ, अर्थकामौ ; गुणवृद्धी, वृद्धिगुणौ ; आद्यन्तौ, अन्तादी

Pūrvanipāta must be enjoined to both among *dharma* etc. Viz. *Dharmārthāu, arthadharmāu ; kāmārthāu, arthakāmāu ; guṇavṛddhī, vṛddhiguṇāu ; ādyantāu, antādī*.

सप्तमीविशेषणे बहुव्रीहौ (2, 2, 35)

बहुव्रीहौ सर्वनामसङ्ख्ययोरुपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to add *sarvanāmasaṅkhyayōḥ* with reference to *bahuvrīhi*.

बहुव्रीहौ सर्वनामसङ्ख्ययोरुपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - विश्वदेवः, विश्वयशाः; द्विपुत्रः, द्विभार्यः

There is need to add that pronouns and numerals get the *pūrvanipāta*, so that the forms *viśvadēvaḥ*, *viśvayaśāḥ*, *dviputraḥ* and *dvibhāryaḥ* may be secured.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* states that *viśva* is *viśēṣya* in *viśvadēva* and prefers the example *dviśuklaḥ* to the last two.

अथ यत्र सङ्ख्यासर्वनाम्नोरेव बहुव्रीहिः कस्य तत्र पूर्वनिपातेन भवितव्यम् ?

Which should have *pūrvanipāta* when both *saṅkhyā* and *sarvanāman* appear in *bahuvrīhi* ?

परत्वात् सङ्ख्यायाः - द्व्यन्याय त्र्यन्याय

To *saṅkhyā* since it is read later in the *vārttika*. Viz. *Dvyanyāya* and *tryanyāya*.

वा प्रियस्य Optional *pūrvanipāta* to *priya*.

वा प्रियस्य पूर्वनिपातो भवतीति वक्तव्यम् - प्रियगुडः, गुडप्रियः

It must be stated that *pūrvanipāta* is optional with reference to *priya*. Viz. *Priyaguḍaḥ* and *guḍapriyaḥ*.

सप्तम्याः पूर्वनिपाते गड्वादिभ्यः परवचनम्

Need to read that the *saptamī* will follow *gaḍu* etc. with reference to *saptamī-pūrvanipāta*.

सप्तम्याः पूर्वनिपाते गड्वादिभ्यः परा सप्तमी भवतीति वक्तव्यम् - गडुकण्ठः, गडुशिराः

It must be enjoined that the *saptamī* which is entitled to have *pūrvanipāta* gets *paranipāta* if *gaḍu* etc. is qualified by it. Viz. *gaḍukaṇṭhaḥ* and *gaḍuśirāḥ*.

निष्ठा (2, 2, 36)

निष्ठायाः पूर्वनिपाते जातिकालसुखादिभ्यः परवचनम्

Need to enjoin that *niṣṭhā* which is entitled to have *pūrvanipāta* follows *jāti*, *kāla*; *sukha* etc.

निष्ठायाः पूर्वनिपाते जातिकालसुखादिभ्यः परा निष्ठा भवतीति वक्तव्यम् - शार्ङ्गजग्धी, पलाण्डुभक्षिती, मासजाता, संवत्सरजाता, सुखजाता, दुःखजाता ।

There is need to enjoin that *niṣṭhā* follows *jāti*, *kāla*, *sukha*, etc. though it is entitled to have *pūrvanipāta* viz. *śārṅgajagdhī*, *palāṇḍubhakṣitī*, *māsajātā*, *saṁvatsarajātā*, *sukhajātā* and *duḥkhajātā*.

न वोत्तरपदस्यान्तोदात्तवचनं ज्ञापकं परभावस्य

It need not be read; the injunction of *antōdāttatva* to the *uttarapada* is *jñāpaka* to *parabhāva*.

न वा वक्तव्यम् No, it need not be read.

किं कारणम्? Why?

उत्तरपदस्यान्तोदात्तवचनं ज्ञापकं परभावस्य । यदयं जातिकालसुखादिभ्यः परस्या निष्ठाया उत्तरपदस्यान्तोदात्तत्वं शास्ति तद् ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः, परात्र निष्ठा भवतीति ।

The injunction of *antōdāttatva* of *uttarapada* is *jñāpaka* to *parabhāva*. Since he (*Sūtrakāra*) enjoins *antōdāttatva* to the *niṣṭhā* which follows *jati*, *kāla*, *sukha* etc. in the *sūtra Jāti-kāla-sukhādibhyaḥ*... (6, 2, 170), he suggests that *niṣṭhā* is here *uttarapada*.

प्रतिषेधे तु पूर्वनिपातप्रसङ्गस्तस्माद्राजदन्तादिषु पाठः

On account of *pratiṣēdha* (for some) there is chance for them to have *pūrvanipāta* and hence there is need to read them in *rājadantādigaṇa*.

प्रतिषेधे तु पूर्वनिपातः प्राप्नोति अकृतमितप्रतिपन्नाः इति, तस्माद्राजदन्तादिषु पाठः कर्तव्यः

There is chance for *pūrvanipāta* for *kṛta*, *mita* etc. on account of the *pratiṣēdha* .... *akṛta-mita-pratipannāḥ* (6, 2, 170) and hence they will have to be read in *Rājadantādigaṇa*.

न वा प्रतिषेधवचनं ज्ञापकं परभावस्य

No, they need not be read; *pratiṣēdha-vacana* is *jñapaka* to *parabhāva*.

न वा कर्तव्यः । अत्रापि प्रतिषेधवचनं ज्ञापकं परा निष्ठा भवतीति ।

No, it need not be read. Even here the mention of *pratiṣēdha* suggests that *niṣṭhā* becomes *parā*.

प्रहरणार्थेभ्यश्च

Niṣṭhā and *saptamī* after words denoting beating instruments.

प्रहरणार्थेभ्यश्च परे निष्ठासप्तम्यौ भवत इति वक्तव्यम् - अस्युद्यतः, मुसलोद्यतः असिपाणिः, दण्डपाणिः

It must be enjoined that *niṣṭhā* and *saptamī* get *paranipāta* when they qualify beating instruments. Viz. *Asyudyataḥ, musalōdyataḥ, asipāṇiḥ* and *daṇḍapāṇiḥ*.

द्वन्द्वे घ्यजाद्यदन्तं विप्रतिषेधेन

Ajādyanta separates *Dvandvē ghi* through *vipratiṣēdha*.

द्वन्द्वे घि इत्यस्माद् अजाद्यदन्तमित्येतद्भवति विप्रतिषेधेन । द्वन्द्वे घि इत्यस्य अवकाशः - पटुगुप्तौ ; अजाद्यदन्तमित्यस्य अवकाशः - उष्ट्रखरौ । इहोभयं प्राप्नोति - इन्द्राग्नी ; अजाद्यदन्तम् इत्येतद् भवति विप्रतिषेधेन ।

The *sūtra Ajādyantam* (2, 2, 33) supersedes the *sūtra Dvandvē ghi* (2, 2, 32) through *vipratiṣēdha. Dvandvē ghi* operates at *paṭuguptāu ; Ajādyadantam* operates at *uṣṭra-kharāu*. Here in *Indrāgnī* both have a chance to operate and *Ajādyanta* operates through *vipratiṣēdha.*

उभाभ्यामल्पाच्तरम्

Alpāctaram (2, 2, 34) supersedes both.

उभाभ्यामल्पाच्तरमित्येतद् भवति विप्रतिषेधेन । द्वन्द्वे घि इत्यस्य अवकाशः - पटुगुप्तौ ; अल्पाच्तरमित्यस्य अवकाशः - वाग्दृषदौ ; इहोभयं प्राप्नोति - वागग्नी - अल्पाच्तरमित्येतद् भवति विप्रतिषेधेन । अजाद्यदन्तमित्यस्य अवकाशः उष्ट्रखरौ ; अल्पाच्तरमित्यस्यावकाशः स एव । इहोभयं प्राप्नोति वागिन्द्रौ ; अल्पाच्तरमित्येतद् भवति विप्रतिषेधेन ।

The *sūtra Alpāctaram* supersedes both through *vipratiṣēdha. Dvandvē ghi* operates at *paṭuguptāu ; Alpāctaram* operates at *vāg-dṛṣadāu* ; herein *vāgagnī* both may operate and *Alpāctaram*

operates through *vipratiṣēdha.* *Ajādyadantam* operates at *uṣṭrakharāu* and *Alpāctaram* operates at the same place (*vāg-dṛṣadāu*) ; here-in *vāg-indrāu* both may operate ; *Alpāctaram* operates through *vipratiṣēdha.*

कडाराः कर्मधारये (2, 2, 38)

कडारादयः *Kaḍārādayaḥ* in place of *kaḍārāḥ.*

कडारादय इति वक्तव्यम् । इहापि यथा स्यात् - गडुलशाण्डिल्यः, शाण्डिल्यगडुलः ; खण्डवात्स्यः, वात्स्यखण्डः ।

Kaḍārādayaḥ should have been read in place of *kaḍārāḥ,* so that the *sūtra* may operate here too in *Gaḍulaśāṇḍilyaḥ, Śāṇḍilyagaḍulaḥ, Khaṇḍavātsyaḥ* and *Vātsyakhaṇḍaḥ.*

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It, then, must be so read.

न वक्तव्यम् । बहुवचननिर्देशात् कडारादय इति विज्ञास्यते ॥

No, it need not be so read. From the use of the plural number in *kaḍārāḥ.* it is taken to refer to *kaḍārādis.*

Āhnika - Twentythree ends.

(Second *Adhyāya*, second *Pāda*, second *Āhnika* ends.)

Āhnika – Twentyfour

(Second *adhyāya*, third *pāda*, first *āhnika*).

अनभिहिते (2, 3, 1)

The meaning of *anabhihitē* and the necessity of this *sūtra* or otherwise are discussed here.

I

अनभिहित इत्युच्यते ; किमिदमनभिहितं नाम ?

The *sūtra* is read *Anabhihitē*. What does *anabhihita* mean?

उक्तं, निर्दिष्टम्, अभिहितम् इति अनर्थान्तरम् । यावद् ब्रूयाद् अनुक्ते, अनिर्दिष्टे इति, तावद् अनभिहिते इति ।

The words *uktam, nirdiṣṭam* and *abhihitam* are synonyms. The word *anabhihitē* conveys the same meaning as the words *anuktē* and *anirdiṣṭē*.

II

अनभिहितवचनमनर्थकमन्यत्रापि विहितस्याभावादभिहिते

The *sūtra Anabhihitē* is not necessary on account of the absence of injunction of what is *abhihita* elsewhere.

अनभिहितवचनमनर्थकम्

The *sūtra Anabhihitē* is not necessary.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

अन्यत्रापि विहितस्याभावाद् अभिहिते - अन्यत्राप्यभिहिते विहितं न भवति ।

On account of the absence of *vihitatā* of what has been *abhihita* elsewhere. What is *abhihita* elsewhere is never enjoined once again.

क्वान्यत्र ? What does *anyatra* refer to ?

चित्रगुः, शबलगुः - बहुव्रीहिणोक्तत्वान्मत्वर्थस्य मत्वर्थीयो न भवति । गर्गाः, वत्साः, विदाः, उर्वाः - यञञ्भ्यामुक्तत्वाद् अपत्यार्थस्य न्याय्योत्पत्तिर्न भवति । सप्तपर्णोऽष्टापद इति समासेनोक्तत्वाद् वीप्साया द्विर्वचनं न भवति ।

Matvartha-pratyaya does not appear in the words *Citraguḥ* and *śabalaguḥ*, since the *matvartha* is expressed by *bahuvrīhi;* the general rule enjoining the *apatyapratyaya* with reference to *Gargāḥ, Vatsāḥ, Bidāḥ* and *Urvāḥ* does not operate, since *apatyārtha* is expressed by *yañ* and *añ*. *Dvirvacana* (reduplication) does not take place in *Saptaparṇaḥ* and *aṣṭāpadam*, since *vīpsā* is expressed by *samāsa*.

NOTE :— 1. *Kāiyaṭa* says that the word *nyāyyaḥ* was used by predecessors in place of (the general rule).

NOTE :—2. The general rule referred to here is *Ata iñ* (4, 1, 95).

NOTE :—3. *Kāiyaṭa* says that there is *vīpsā* in *saptaparṇaḥ* thus :- *Sapta sapta parṇāni asya.*

यत्तावदुच्यते - चित्रगुः शबलगुः इति बहुव्रीहिणोक्तत्वान्मत्वर्थस्य मत्वर्थीयो न भवति इति, अस्तिसामानाधिकरण्ये मतुब् विधीयते, न चात्र अस्तिना सामानाधिकरण्यम् ।

With reference to the first statement that *matvarthapratyaya* is not used after the words *citraguḥ* and *śabalaguḥ* on account of its meaning having been expressed by *bahuvrīhi*, the answer is this :- *Matup* is enjoined to it which is *samānādhikaraṇa* with *asti* and here the component parts of the compound have no *sāmānādhikaraṇya* with *asti*.

यदप्युच्यते - गर्गा वत्सा बिदा उर्वाः, यञञ्भ्यामुक्तत्वाद् अपत्यार्थस्य न्याय्योत्पत्तिर्न भवति इति, समर्थानां प्रथमाद्वा इति वर्तते, न चैतत् समर्थानां प्रथमम्

With reference to the next statement that the general rule enjoining *apatyapratyaya* does not operate in the words *Gargāḥ, Vatsāḥ, Bidāḥ, Urvāḥ*, the answer is this :- There is *anuvṛtti* for *samarthānām prathamād vā* and this *Gargāḥ* etc. does not refer to the first (denoted by *tasya* in the *sūtra Tasyāpatyam*) among *samarthas*.

किं तर्हि ? What then ?

द्वितीयमर्थमुपसंक्रान्तम्

It has reference only to the *artha* of the second word in the *sūtra Tasyāpatyam*.

यदप्युच्यते - सप्तपर्णोऽष्टापद इति समासेनोक्तत्वाद् वीप्साया द्विर्वचनम् न भवतीति, यदत्र वीप्सायुक्तं नादः प्रयुज्यते

With reference to the last statement that reduplication is not found in the words *saptaparṇaḥ* and *aṣṭāpadaḥ* on account of the *vīpsā* having been expressed by *samāsa*, the answer is this :- That which is associated with *vīpsā* is not used here.

किं पुनस्तत् ? What is it ?

पर्वणि पर्वणि सप्त पर्णान्यस्य, पङ्क्तौ पङ्क्तौ अष्टौ पदानि अस्य -

The words which are associated with *vīpsā* are *parvan* and *paṅkti*, since the *vigrahavākyas* of *Saptaparṇaḥ* and *aṣṭāpadaḥ* are *parvaṇi parvaṇi sapta parṇāni asya* and *paṅktāu paṅktāu aṣṭāu padāni asya*.

श्नम्बहुजकक्षु तर्हि - श्नम्, भिनत्ति छिनत्ति, श्नमा उक्तत्वात् कर्तृत्वस्य कर्तरि शब् न भवति; बहुच्, बहुकृतं बहुभिन्नम् इति बहुचा उक्तत्वाद् ईषदसमाप्तेः कल्पबादयो न भवन्ति; अकच् उच्चकैः नीचकैः इति अकचोक्तत्वात् कुत्सादीनां कादयो न भवन्ति

If so, *anyatra* refers to *śnam*, *bahuc* and *akac*. With reference to *śnam* - *Kartari śap* does not operate in *bhinatti* and *chinatti* since *kartṛtva* is expressed by *śnam* [1]. With reference to *bahuc* - the suffixes *kalpap* etc. denoting *īṣad-asamāpti* do not appear in *bahukṛtam*, and *bahubhinnam*, since it is expressed by *bahuc*; with reference to *akac* - the *pratyayas ka* etc. denoting *kutsatva* etc. do not appear in the words *uccakāiḥ* and *nīcakāiḥ*, since it is expressed by *akac*.

ननु च श्नम् बहुजकचोऽपवादाः, ते अपवादत्वात् बाधका भविष्यन्ति ।

1. This is based on the view of the *Pūrvācāryās* that *bhāva*, *karma* and *kartā* are the meanings of conjugational signs.

Oh! the *sūtras* dealing with *śnam*, *bahuc* and *akac* are *apavādas*. Since they are *apavādas*, they *veto* the *sūtras* *Kartari śap* etc.

श्नम्बहुजकक्षु नानादेशत्वाद् उत्सर्गाप्रतिषेधः

With reference to *śnam*, *bahuc* and *akac*, there is no *pratiṣēdha* for the *utsarga* on account their being in different places.

समानदेशैरपवादैरुत्सर्गाणां बाधनं भवति ; नानादेशत्वान्न प्राप्नोति ।

Utsargas are vetoed by *apavādas* only if they are in the same place. Since, in these cases, they are in different places, they cannot veto *utsargas*.

किं पुनरिह अकर्तव्योऽनभिहिताधिकारः क्रियते, आहोस्विद् अन्यत्र कर्तव्यो न क्रियते ?

Which is the view of the objector, whether the *anabhihādhikāra*, which should not be read here, is read, or whether the *anabhihitādhikāra* which should be read elsewhere is not read there ?

इह अकर्तव्यः क्रियते । एष एव हि न्याय्यः, यदभिहिते विहितं न स्यात्

It should not be read here, but it is read. This is the proper course not to enjoin anything in the *śāstra* which is already expressed by another.

अनभिहितस्तु विभक्त्यर्थः तस्मादनभिहितं वचनम्

Vibhaktyartha (*ēkatva* etc.) is *anabhihita* and hence is *anabhihitē* read.

अनभिहितस्तु विभक्त्यर्थः *Vibhaktyartha* has not been expressed.

कः पुनर्विभक्त्यर्थः ? What is *vibhaktyartha ?*

एकत्वादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः । तेष्वनभिहितेषु कर्मादयोऽभिहिता विभक्तीनामुत्पत्तौ निमित्तत्वाय मा भूवन्निति । तस्माद् अनभिहितवचनम् । तस्माद् अनभिहिताधिकारः क्रियते । अवश्यं चैतदेवं विज्ञेयम् - एकत्वादयो विभक्त्यर्था इति ।

Ekatva etc. are *vibhaktyarthas*. When they are not expressed, it is not desired that the *karmatva* etc. expressed otherwise need not serve as *nimitta* to decide the *vibhakti*. Hence is the

necessity to read *Anabhihitē.* For the same reason *anabhihitādhikāra* is resorted to. It must necessarily be understood that *ēkatva* etc. are *vibhaktyarthas.*

अभिहिते हि प्रथमाभावः

If it is taken as *abhihita*, there is no chance for *prathamā.*

यो हि मन्यते 'कर्मादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः तेष्वभिहितेषु सामर्थ्यान्मे विभक्तिनामुत्पत्तिर्न भविष्यति' इति, प्रथमा तस्य न प्राप्नोति

There is no chance for *prathamā* according to him who thinks that, on taking *karmādis* to be *vibhaktyarthas* and on their being expressed, there is no chance for other *vibhaktis* to appear through *sāmarthya.*

क्व ? Where ?

वृक्षः, प्लक्षः In *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ.*

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

प्रातिपदिकेनोक्तः प्रातिपदिकार्थ इति

Since *prātipadikārtha* is expressed by *prātipadika.*

न क्वचित् प्रातिपदिकेनानुक्तः प्रातिपदिकार्थः । उच्यते च प्रथमा । सा वचनाद् भविष्यति । तवैव तु खल्वेष दोषः – यस्य ते एकत्वादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः । अभिहिते प्रथमाभावः इति प्रथमा ते न प्राप्नोति

There is no place where *prātipadikārtha* is not expressed by *prātipadika.* *Prathamā* is enjoined and hence *prathamā* sets in on the strength of the injunction. But, on the other hand, the defect that was raised against me by you will appear in your case, who hold that *ēkatva* etc. are *vibhaktyarthas.* *Prathamā* will not appear, since it is expressed.

क्व ? Where ?

पचत्योदनं देवदत्त इति

In the word *Dēvadattaḥ* found in the sentence *Pacati ōdanam Dēvadattaḥ.*

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

तिङोक्ता एकत्वादयः इति । अनभिहिताधिकारं च त्वं करोषि, परिगणनं च
Since *ēkatva* atc. are expressed by *tiṅ*. You read *anabhihitādhikāra* and *pariganana* [1].

न क्वचित् तिङा एकत्वादीनामनभिधानम्, उच्यते च प्रथमा, सा वचनाद् भविष्यति
There is no place where *ēkatva* etc. are not expressed by *tiṅ*; it is enjoined as *prātipadikārtha* ... (2, 3, 46) and it makes its appearance on the strength of the injunction.

ननु चेऽानभिधानं वृक्षः प्लक्ष इति
Oh, there will be *anabhidhāna* here, in *vṛkṣaḥ*, and *plakṣaḥ*.

अत्राप्यभिधानमस्ति There is *abhidhāna* even here.

कथम् ? How ?

वक्ष्यत्येतत् - अस्तिर्भवन्तीपरः प्रथमपुरुषोऽप्रयुज्यमानोऽप्यस्ति इति । वृक्षः प्लक्षः, अस्तीति गम्यते । तवैव तु खल्वेष दोषो यस्य ते कर्मादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः, अभिहिते प्रथमाभाव इति, प्रथमा ते प्राप्नोति ।
He is going to say that the root *as* followed by *laṭ*, though not mentioned, may be taken as understood. With reference to *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ*, *asti* is taken to be understood. This defect that *prathamā* will not appear will arise only to you who hold the view that *karmatva* etc. are the *vibhaktyarthas* and *prathamā* sets in, if *karmatva* etc. are expressed.

क्व ? Where ?

कटं करोति भीष्ममुदारं शोभनं दर्शनीयम् इति - कटशब्दात् उत्पद्यमानया द्वितीयया अभिहितं कर्मेति कृत्वा भीष्मादिभ्यो द्वितीया न प्राप्नोति ।
Dvitīyā will have no chance to appear after the words *bhīṣma*, *udāra*, *śōbhana* and *darśanīya* in the sentence *kaṭam karōti bhīṣmam udāram śōbhanam darśanīyam*, since *karmatva* is expressed by the *dvitīyā* which follows the stem *kaṭa*.

1. *Pariganana* is dealt with later on in the *sūtra*.

necessity to read *Anabhihitē.* For the same reason *anabhihitādhikāra* is resorted to. It must necessarily be understood that *ēkatva* etc. are *vibhaktyarthas.*

अभिहिते हि प्रथमाभावः

If it is taken as *abhihita*, there is no chance for *prathamā.*

यो हि मन्यते ‘ कर्मादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः तेष्वभिहितेषु सामर्थ्यान्मे विभक्तीनामुत्पत्तिर्न भविष्यति ’ इति, प्रथमा तस्य न प्राप्नोति

There is no chance for *prathamā* according to him who thinks that, on taking *karmādis* to be *vibhaktyarthas* and on their being expressed, there is no chance for other *vibhaktis* to appear through *sāmarthya.*

क्व ? Where ?

वृक्षः, प्लक्षः In *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ.*

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

प्रातिपदिकेनोक्तः प्रातिपदिकार्थ इति

Since *prātipadikārtha* is expressed by *prātipadika.*

न क्वचित् प्रातिपदिकेनानुक्तः प्रातिपदिकार्थः । उच्यते च प्रथमा । सा वचनाद् भविष्यति । तत्रैव तु खल्वेष दोषः - यस्य ते एकत्वादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः । अभिहिते प्रथमाभावः इति प्रथमा ते न प्राप्नोति

There is no place where *prātipadikārtha* is not expressed by *prātipadika.* *Prathamā* is enjoined and hence *prathamā* sets in on the strength of the injunction. But, on the other hand, the defect that was raised against me by you will appear in your case, who hold that *ēkatva* etc. are *vibhaktyarthas.* *Prathamā* will not appear, since it is expressed.

क्व ? Where ?

पचत्योदनं देवदत्त इति

In the word *Dēvadattaḥ* found in the sentence *Pacati Odanam Dēvadattaḥ.*

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

तिङोक्ता एकत्वादयः इति । अनभिहिताधिकारं च त्वं करोषि, परिगणनं च
Since *ēkatva* atc. are expressed by *tiṅ*. You read *anabhi-hitādhikāra* and *pariganana* [1].

न क्वचित् तिङा एकत्वादीनामनभिधानम्, उच्यते च प्रथमा, सा वचनाद् भविष्यति
There is no place where *ēkatva* etc. are not expressed by *tiṅ*; it is enjoined as *prātipadikārtha* ... (2, 3, 46) and it makes its appearance on the strength of the injunction.

ननु चेऽनभिधानं वृक्षः प्लक्ष इति
Oh, there will be *anabhidhāna* here, in *vṛkṣaḥ*, and *plakṣaḥ*.

अत्राप्यभिधानमस्ति There is *abhidhāna* even here.

कथम् ? How ?

वक्ष्यत्येतत् - अस्तिर्भवन्तीपरः प्रथमपुरुषोऽप्रयुज्यमानोऽप्यस्ति इति । वृक्षः प्लक्षः, अस्तीति गम्यते । तवैव तु खल्वेष दोषो यस्य ते कर्मादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः, अभिहिते प्रथमाभाव इति, प्रथमा ते प्राप्नोति ।
He is going to say that the root *as* followed by *laṭ*, though not mentioned, may be taken as understood. With reference to *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ, asti* is taken to be understood. This defect that *prathamā* will not appear will arise only to you who hold the view that *karmatva* etc. are the *vibhaktyarthas* and *prathamā* sets in, if *karmatva* etc. are expressed.

क्व ? Where ?

कटं करोति भीष्ममुदारं शोभनं दर्शनीयम् इति - कटशब्दात् उत्पद्यमानया द्वितियया अभिहितं कर्मेति कृत्वा भीष्मादिभ्यो द्वितिया न प्राप्नोति ।
Dvitīyā will have no chance to appear after the words *bhīṣma, udāra, śōbhana* and *darśanīya* in the sentence *kaṭam karōti bhīṣmam udāram śōbhanam darśanīyam*, since *karmatva* is expressed by the *dvitīyā* which follows the stem *kaṭa*.

1. *Pariganana* is dealt with later on in the *sūtra*.

का तर्हि प्राप्नोति ? What will, then, have the chance to come?

प्रथमा । तद्यथा, कृतः कटो भीष्म उदारः शोभनो दर्शनीय. इति करोते-रुत्पद्यमानेन क्तेन अभिहितं कर्मेति कृत्वा भीष्मादिभ्यो द्वितीया न भवति
Prathamā. It may be explained thus:- On taking that *karmatva* is expressed by the suffix *ta* after the root *kṛ*, *dvitīyā* does not set in after the words *bhīṣhma* etc. in the sentence *kṛtaḥ kaṭō bhīṣma udāraḥ śōbhanō darśanīyaḥ.*

का तर्हि ? What, then, will come there ?

प्रथमा *Prathamā.*

नैष दोषः । न हि ममानभिहिताधिकारोऽस्ति । नापि परिगणनम् । सामर्थ्यान्मे विभक्तीनामुत्पत्तिर्भविष्यति, अस्ति च सामर्थ्यम्
This difficulty does not arise. For there is neither *anabhi-hitādhikāra* nor *parigaṇana* according to my hold. *Vibhaktis* appear, in my opinion, according to *sāmarthya.* There is *sāmarthya.*

किम् ? What?

कर्मविशेषो वक्तव्यः *Karmaviśēṣa* has to be stated.

अथ वा कटोऽपि कर्म, भीष्मादयोऽपि, तत्र कर्मणि इत्येव सिद्धम्
Or, *kaṭa* is *karma* and *bhīṣma* etc. too are *karma.* Hence *dvitīyā* comes after each of them by the *sūtra Karmaṇi dvitīyā* itself.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *dvitīyā* appears after each by associating it with *karōti* individually and the *viśēṣaṇa-viśēṣya-bhāva* is afterwards resorted to by *ēkavākyatā.*

अथ वा कट एव कर्म, तत्सामानाधिकरण्याद् भीष्मादिभ्यो द्वितीया भविष्यति।
Or *kaṭa* alone is *karma* and *dvitīyā* comes after *bhīṣmādis* on account of their *sāmānādhikaraṇya* with *kaṭa.*

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that this solution arises on the assumption that *dravya* alone takes *karmasaṁjñā* and not *guṇa.*

अस्ति खल्वपि विशेषः - कटं करोति भीष्ममुदारं शोभनं दर्शनीयं इति च, कृतः कटः भीष्मः उदारः शोभनः दर्शनीय इति च - करोतेरुत्पद्यमानः क्तः अनवयवेन

सर्वं कर्माभिधत्ते, कटशब्दात् पुनरुत्पद्यमानया द्वितीयया यत् कटस्थं कर्म तत् शक्य-मभिधातुं न कर्मविशेषः

Besides there is some difference between the expressions, *kaṭam karōti bhīṣmam udāram śōbhanam darśanīyam* and *kṛtaḥ kaṭaḥ bhīṣmaḥ udāraḥ śōbhanaḥ darśanīyaḥ*. The *kta* which is added to the root *kṛ* takes all as its *karma,* while the second case suffix added to the word *kaṭa* can refer only to the *karmatva* in *kaṭa* and nothing else.

तवैव तु खलु एष दोषो यस्य ते एकत्वादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः, अभिहिते प्रथमाभावः इति प्रथमा ते न प्राप्नोति

This defect will arise only according to your theory that *ēkatvādis* are *vibhaktyarthas*. You will have no chance to use *prathamā*, since it has been expressed.

क्व ? Where ?

एकः, द्वौ, बहवः इति In the words *ēkaḥ, dvāu* and *bahavaḥ*.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

प्रातिपदिकेनोक्ता एकत्वादय इति

Since *ēkatva* etc. has been expressed by the stem.

कर्मादिष्वपि वै विभक्त्यर्थेषु, अवश्यम् एकत्वादयो निमित्तत्वेनोपादेयाः - कर्मण एकत्वे, कर्मणो द्वित्वे, कर्मणो बहुत्वे इति । न च एकत्वादीनामेकत्वादयः सन्ति । अथ सन्ति, ममापि सन्ति । तेष्वनभिहितेषु प्रथमा भविष्यति ।

Even when *karmādis* are taken as *vibhaktyartha, ēkatvādis* have to be taken as their *viśēṣaṇas* thus :—*Karmaṇa ēkatvē, karmaṇō dvitvē* and *karmaṇō bahutvē*. There cannot be *ēkatvādis* in *ēkatvādis*. If they are in your opinion, they are also in my opinion. Since they are not expressed, *prathamā* sets in.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *ēkatva*, the meaning of the stem, is different from *ēkatva*, the meaning of the suffix.

अथ वा उभयवचना ह्येते द्रव्यं चाहुर्गुणं च । यस्यासौ गुणः, तस्यानुक्ता एकत्वादय इति कृत्वा प्रथमा भविष्यति ।

Or these express both - *dravya* and *guṇa*. *Prathamā* sets in since the *ēkatvādis* of that (*dravya*) in which they are *apradhāna* are not expressed.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *dravya* which is *guṇōpasarjana* is expressed by the stem and the suffix expresses the *guṇa* which is *dravyōpasarjana*.

अथ वा सङ्ख्या नामेयं परप्रधाना, सङ्ख्येयमनया विशेष्यम् । यदि चात्र प्रथमा न स्यात् सङ्ख्येयमविशेषितं स्यात्

Or what is called *saṅkhyā* has another for its *āśraya* and *saṅkhyēya* is its *viśēṣya*. If there is no *prathamā* here, *saṅkhyēya* will be left *aviśēṣita*.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that stem alone is never used and its meaning is the *viśēṣya* of the *saṅkhyā*.

अथ वा वक्ष्यति तत्र वचनग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनम् - उक्तेष्वप्येकत्वादिषु प्रथमा यथा स्याद् इति ।

Or he is going to say (under 2, 3, 46) that the *prayōjana* of reading *vacana* in that *sūtra* is that *prathamā* will be used even though *ēkatva* has been expressed.

अथ वा समयाद् भविष्यति

Or it is used by the accepted principle (that neither the stem alone can be used without the *pratyaya* nor the *pratyaya* alone without *prakṛti*.)

यदि सामयिकी, न नियोगतः, अन्याः कस्मान्न भवन्ति ?

If it is through *samaya* and not through *niyama*, how is it that other *vibhaktis* do not make their appearance there ?

कर्मादीनामभावात्

(There is no chance for others to set in,) since *karmādis* do not exist.

षष्ठी तर्हि प्राप्नोति In that case *ṣaṣṭhī* has a chance.

शेषलक्षणा षष्ठी, अशेषत्वान्न भविष्यति

Ṣaṣṭhī is enjoined with reference to that which is other than *karmādis* and *prātipadikārtha* and it does not set in here in the absence of *śēṣatva*.

एवमपि व्यतिकरः प्राप्नोति - एकस्मिन्नपि द्विवचनबहुवचने प्राप्नुतः, द्वयोप्येकवचनबहुवचने प्राप्नुतः, बहुष्वपि एकवचनद्विवचने प्राप्नुतः

Even then there is chance for one to be used in place of another—Dual and plural suffixes may be used even to denote one object; singular and plural suffixes may be used even to denote two objects; and singular and dual suffixes may be used to denote many.

अर्थतो व्यवस्था भविष्यति

It will be determined by *sāmarthya*.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* reads here that the need of the *sūtra* is established on the tenet that *saṅkhyā* is *vibhaktyartha*.

परिगणनं कर्तव्यम् There is need to make an inventory.

तिङ्कृत्तद्धितसमासैः परिसङ्ख्यानम्

Specification through *tiṅ*, *kṛt*, *taddhita* and *samāsa*.

तिङ्कृत्तद्धितसमासैः परिसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् तिङ् - क्रियते कटः । कृत् - कृतः कटः । तद्धितः - औपगवः, कापटवः । समासः - चित्रगुः, शबलगुः

It must be specified that the *abhidhāna* is made by *tiṅ*, *kṛt*, *taddhita* and *samāsa*, as in *kriyatē kaṭaḥ* (*tiṅ*) ; *kṛtaḥ kaṭaḥ* (*kṛt*) ; *Āupagavaḥ* and *Kāpaṭavaḥ* (*taddhita*) ; *Citraguḥ* and *Śabalaguḥ* (*samāsa*).

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *ṣaṣṭhī* does not appear in *āupagava*, since the *taddhita* suffix expresses the relation of *apatya* and *apatyavān* and in *Citragu*, since the *samāsa* expresses the relation of *sva-svāmitva-bhāva* in case *anabhihitē* is taken as *adhikāra*.

उत्सर्गे हि प्रातिपदिकसामानाधिकरण्ये विभक्तिवचनम्

Need for the injunction of the *vibhakti* with reference to those which are *samānādhikaraṇa* with the stem in case *anabhihitē* is taken as *adhikāra*.

उत्सर्गे हि प्रातिपदिकसामानाधिकरण्ये विभक्तिर्वक्तव्या

If *Anabhihitē* is taken as *adhikāra*, there is need to enjoin the *vibhakti* which is to be used along with the words which are *samānādhikaraṇa* with the stem.

क ? Where ?

कटं करोति भीष्ममुदारं शोभनं दर्शनीयमिति । कटशब्दाद् उत्पद्यमानया द्वितीयया अभिहितं कर्मेति कृत्वा भीष्मादिभ्यो द्वितीया न प्राप्नोति ।
In the sentence *kaṭam karōti bhīṣmam udāram śōbhanam darśanīyam*. *Dvitīyā* has on chance to be used after the words *bhīṣma* etc. on the understanding that *karmatva* has been expressed by the *dvitīyā* used after the word *kaṭa*.

का तर्हि स्यात् ? What case will then appear ?

षष्ठी *Ṣaṣṭhī*.

शेषलक्षणा षष्ठी, अशेषत्वान्न भविष्यति । अन्या अपि न प्राप्नुवन्ति
Ṣaṣṭhī is enjoined with reference to *śēṣa* and *śēṣatva* does not exist here. Other cases too may not appear.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

कर्मादीनामभावात् On account of the absence of *karmatva* etc.

समयश्च कृतः - न केवला प्रकृतिः प्रयोक्तव्या, न च केवलः प्रत्ययः इति । न चान्या उत्पद्यमाना एतमभिसम्बन्धमुत्सहन्ते वक्तुमिति कृत्वा द्वितीया भविष्यति ।
There is the tenet that neither *prakṛti* alone nor *pratyaya* alone should be used. Second case suffix is used there, since other suffixes cannot express the desired relation between them and *kaṭa*.

अथ वा कटोऽपि कर्म भीष्मादयोऽपि, तत्र कर्मणि इत्येव सिद्धम्
Or *kaṭa* is *karma* and *bhīṣmādis* too ; *dvitīyā* sets in there on the strength of the *sūtra Karmaṇi dvitīyā*.

अथ वा कट एव कर्म, तत्सामानाधिकरण्याद् भीष्मादिभ्यो द्वितीया भविष्यति
Or *kaṭa* alone is *karma* and *dvitīyā* is used after *bhīṣmādis* on account of their *sāmānādhikaraṇya* with *kaṭa*.

तस्मान्नार्थः परिगणनेन
Hence no purpose is served by *parigaṇana*.

द्वयोः क्रिययोः कारकेऽन्यतरेणाभिहिते विभक्त्यभावप्रसङ्गः
Vibhakti has no chance after the noun denoting the *dravya* if its meaning is expressed by the *pratyaya* after one of the two *kriyās*.

क्व ? Where ?

प्रासादे आस्ते, शयने आस्ते इति

In the sentences *Prāsādē āstē* and *śayanē āstē*.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

सदिप्रत्ययेन अभिहितमधिकरणमिति कृत्वा सप्तमी न भवति

Taking that *adhikaraṇatva* is expressed by the *pratyaya ghañ* after the root *sad*, *saptamī* cannot be used after *prāsāda*.

न वान्यतरेणानभिधानात्

No, since it is not expressed by the *pratyaya* after another.

न वैष दोषः This difficulty does not arise.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

अन्यतरेणानभिधानात् । अन्यतरेणात्रानभिधानम्; सदिप्रत्ययेनाभिधानम्, असिप्रत्ययेनानाभिधानम्; यतोऽनभिधानं तदाश्रया सप्तमी भविष्यति ।

On account of its not being expressed by one of the two. There is *anabhidhāna* by one of the two; there is *abhidhāna* by the *pratyaya* after *sad*, but there is no *abhidhāna* by the *pratyaya* after *ās*; since there is *anabhidhāna* by one, *saptamī* depending upon it, appears.

कुतो नु खल्वेतत् सत्यभिधाने चानभिधाने चानभिहिताश्रया सप्तमी भविष्यति, न पुनरभिहिताश्रयः प्रतिषेध इति ?

What is the authority sanctioning that, in the presence of *abhidhāna* and *anabhidhāna*, the *saptamī* depending upon *anabhidhāna* sets in and the *pratiṣēdha* of the same depending upon *abhidhāna* does not appear ?

अनभिहिते हि विधानम्

For there is *vidhāna* in the presence of *anabhidhāna*.

अनभिहिते हि सप्तमी विधीयते, नाभिहिते प्रतिषेधः

For there is the injunction of *saptamī* when there is *anabhidhāna* and there is no *pratiṣēdha* when there is *abhidhāna*.

यद्यपि तावदत्रैतच्छक्यते वक्तुं यत्रान्या चान्या च क्रिया, यत्र तु खलु सैव क्रिया तत्र कथम् - आसने आस्ते, शयने शेते

Even though such an answer can be given when there are two different *kriyās*, what answer can be given when the two *kriyās* are the same, as in the sentences *Āsanē āstē* and *śayanē śētē* ?

अत्राप्यन्यत्वमस्ति Even here one is different from the other.

कुतः ? How ?

कालभेदात् साधनभेदाच्च । एकस्य अत्र आसेः आसिस्साधनं, सर्वकालश्च प्रत्ययः । अपरस्य वाह्यं साधनं, वर्तमानकालश्च प्रत्ययः

On account of *kālabhēda* and *sādhanabhēda*. For one the meaning of the root *ās* is *sādhana* and the *pratyaya* denotes all time and for another the *sādhana* is the meaning of the word other than the verb (like *Dēvadatta*) and the *pratyaya* denotes the present time.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that the words *āsana*, *śayana* etc. denote only the object and case-suffix after them is necessary to denote its relation with the following verb.

किं पुनर्द्रव्यं साधनमाहोस्विद् गुणः ? Is *dravya sādhana* or *guṇa* ?

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *śakti* is referred to by *guṇa*.

किं चातः ? What if, if it is either ?

यदि द्रव्यं साधनं नैतदन्यत् भवत्यभिहितात् । अथ हि गुणः साधनं, भवत्येतद् अन्यद् अभिहितात् । अन्यो हि सदिगुणः, अन्यश्च आसिगुणः ।

If *dravya* is *sādhana*, it does not become different from the *abhihita* ; if, on the other hand, *guṇa* is *sādhana*, it is different from the *abhihita*. For *sadi-guṇa* is one and *āsi-guṇa* is another.

किं पुनः साधनं न्याय्यम् ?

Which is legitimate to be taken as *sādhana* ?

गुण इत्याह *Guṇa*, says he.

कथं ज्ञायते ? How is it arrived at ?

एवं हि कश्चित् कञ्चित् पृच्छति - क देवदत्त इति । स तस्मै आचष्टे - असौ वृक्षे इति । कतरस्मिन्? यस्तिष्ठति इति । स वृक्षोऽधिकरणं भूत्वा अन्येन शब्देनाभिसम्बध्यमानः कर्ता सम्पद्यते । द्रव्ये पु?: साधने सति यत्कर्म कर्मैव स्यात्, यत्करणं करणमेव, यदधिकरणमधिकरणमेव ।

One asks another, "Where is *Dēvadatta?*" He replies to him, "He is on the tree." "In which?" "On that which stands." The tree which was *adhikaraṇa* becomes *kartā* when it is associated with another word. If *sādhana* is taken to be *dravya*, that which was *karma* will ever remain *karma*, that which was *karaṇa* will ever remain *karaṇa* and that which was *adhikaraṇa* will ever remain *adhikaraṇa*.

अनभिहितवचनमनर्थकं प्रथमाविधानस्यानवकाशत्वात्

Reading of *anabhihitādhikāra* is unnecessary, on account of the *prathamā* which has been enjoined not having room to operate.

अनभिहितवचनमनर्थकम्

Reading of *Anabhihitē* serves no purpose.

किं कारणम्? Why?

प्रथमाविधानस्यानवकाशत्वात् । अनवकाशा प्रथमा, सा वचनाद् भविष्यति

On account of *prathamā* which is enjoined not having room to operate. *Prathamā* is *anavakāśā* and it must be used since it is enjoined.

सावकाशा प्रथमा? *Prathamā* has room to operate.

कोऽवकाशः? What is the *avakāśa*?

अकारकम् - वृक्षः प्लक्षः इति

Isolated word like *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ*.

अवकाशोऽकारकमिति चेन्न, अस्तिर्भवन्तीपरः प्रथमपुरुषोऽप्रयुज्यमानोऽप्यस्ति

It is not right to say that *akāraka* is *avakāśa*, since the root *as* followed by *laṭ* is understood after the nouns in third person.

अवकाशोऽकारकमिति चेत्, तन्न

If it is said that *akāraka* is *avakāśa*, it is not correct.

किं कारणम् Why?

अस्तिर्भवन्तीपरः प्रथमपुरुषोऽप्रयुज्यमानोऽप्यस्ति इति गम्यते - वृक्षः प्लक्षः अस्ति इति गम्यते

It is taken that the root *as* followed by *laṭ* is understood after the words of third person. When *vṛkṣaḥ* or *plakṣaḥ* alone is read, it is taken to mean *vṛkṣaḥ asti* or *plakṣaḥ asti.*

विप्रतिषेधाद्वा प्रथमाभावः

Or the presence of *prathamā* through *vipratiṣēdha.*

अथ वा द्वितीयादयः क्रियन्तां प्रथमा वा इति, प्रथमा भविष्यति विप्रतिषेधेन। द्वितीयादीनामवकाशः - कटं करोति भीष्मम् उदारं शोभनं दर्शनीयम् इति। प्रथमाया अवकाशः, अकारकं वृक्षः प्लक्ष इति। इहोभयं प्राप्नोति - कृतः कटो भीष्म उदारः शोभनो दर्शनीय इति। प्रथमा भविष्यति विप्रतिषेधेन।

Or when doubt arises whether to use *dvitīyādis* or *prathamā*, *prathamā* sets in through *vipratiṣēdha*. *Kaṭam karōti bhīṣmam udāram śōbhanam darśanīyam* is the *avakāṣa* for *dvitīyādis*. *Vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ*, which are *akārakas* are the *avakāśa* for *prathamā*. Both may operate in *kṛtaḥ kaṭō bhīṣma udāraḥ śōbhanō darśanīyaḥ* and *prathamā* sets in through *vipratiṣēdha.*

न सिध्यति, परत्वात् षष्ठी प्राप्नोति

No, it cannot be accomplished; *ṣaṣṭhī* being *para,* will set in.

शेषलक्षणा षष्ठी, अशेषत्वान्न भविष्यति

Ṣaṣṭhī is enjoined to *śēṣa* and it does not set in on account of this not coming within the purview of *śēṣatva*.

कृत्प्रयोगे तु परं विधानं षष्ठ्यास्तत्प्रतिषेधार्थम्

To prohibit *ṣaṣṭhī* which has a chance in *kṛt-prayōga* being *para.*

कृत्प्रयोगे तु परत्वात् षष्ठी प्राप्नोति। तत्प्रतिषेधार्थमनभिहिताधिकारः कर्तव्यः - कर्तव्यः कट इति

कृत्प्रयोगे तु परत्वात् षष्ठी प्राप्नोति । तत्प्रतिषेधार्थमनभिहिताधिकारः कर्तव्यः - कर्तव्यः कट इति

There is chance for *ṣaṣṭhī*, being *para*, in *kṛtprayōga*. *Anabhihitādhikāra* is necessary to prohibit it so that the expression *kartavyaḥ kaṭaḥ* can be accomplished.

स कथं कर्तव्यः ?

Under which circumstances should it be done ?

यदि एकत्वादयो विभक्त्यर्थाः

If *ēkatva* etc. are the meanings of *vibhakti*.

अथ हि कर्मादयो विभक्त्यर्था नार्थोऽनभिहिताधिकारेण

If, on the other hand, *karmādis* are *vibhaktyarthas*, no purpose is served by *anabhihitādhikāra*.

कर्मणि द्वितीया (2, 3, 2)

समयानिकषाहायोगेषूपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to supplement that *dvitīyā* takes place in association with the words *samayā*, *nikaṣā*, and *hā*.

समयानिकषाहायोगेषूपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - समया ग्रामम्, निकषा ग्रामम्, हा देवदत्तम्, हा यज्ञदत्तम्

There is need for *upasaṅkhyāna* of *dvitīyā* in association with *samayā*, *nikaṣā* and *hā*. Viz. *Samayā grāmam*, *nikaṣā grāmam*, *hā Dēvadattam* and *hā Yajñadattam*.

अपर आह - Another says :

द्वितीयाविधानेऽभितःपरितःसमयानिकषाध्यधिधिग्योगेषूपसङ्ख्यानम्

With reference to *dvitīyā-vidhāna*, there is need for *upasaṅkhyāna* in association with *abhitaḥ*, *paritaḥ*, *samayā*, *nikaṣā*, *adhyadhi* and *dhik*.

द्वितीयाविधानेऽभितःपरितःसमयानिकषाध्यधिधिग्योगेषूपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - अभितो ग्रामम्, परितो ग्रामम्, समया ग्रामम्, निकषा ग्रामम्, अध्यधि ग्रामम्, धिग् जाल्मम्, धिग् वृषलम्

There is need to supplement that *dvitīyā* appears in association with *abhitaḥ*, *paritaḥ* and *samayā*, *nikaṣā*, *adhyadhi* and *dhik*. Viz. *abhitō grāmam*, *paritō grāmam*, *samayā grāmam*, *nikaṣā grāmam*, *adhyadhi grāmam*, *dhig jālmam* and *dhig vṛṣalam*.

अपर आह Another says:

उभसर्वतसोः कार्या धिगुपर्यादिषु त्रिषु ।
द्वितीयाम्रेडितान्तेषु ततोऽन्यत्रापि दृश्यते ॥

Dvitīyā is seen after *ubhayataḥ*, *sarvataḥ*, *dhik*, *uparyupari*, *adhyadhi*, *adhōdhaḥ* and elsewhere.

उभसर्वइत्येताभ्यां तसन्ताभ्यां योगे द्वितीया वक्तव्या - उभयतो ग्रामम्, सर्वतो ग्रामम् । धिग्योगे - धिग् जाल्मम्, धिग् वृषलम् । उपर्यादिषु त्रिष्वाम्रेडितान्तेषु द्वितीया वक्तव्या - उपर्युपरि ग्रामम्, अध्यधि ग्रामम्, अधोधो ग्रामम् । ततोऽन्यत्रापि दृश्यते - न देवदत्तं प्रतिभाति किञ्चित्, बुभुक्षितं न प्रतिभाति किञ्चित्

Dvitīyā should be enjoined in association with the stem *ubha* and *sarva* followed by *tas*. Viz. *Ubhayatō grāmam* and *sarvatō grāmam*; in association with *dhik* viz. *dhig jālmam* and *dhig vṛṣalam*; in association with *upari* etc. in reduplication viz. *uparyupari grāmam*, *adhyadhi grāmam*, *adhōdhō grāmam*. It is seen elsewhere too viz. *Na Dēvadattam pratibhāti kiñcit*, *bubhukṣitam na pratibhāti kiñcit*.

तृतीया च होश्छन्दसि (2, 3, 3)

किमर्थमिदमुच्यते ? Why is this *sūtra* read ?

तृतीया यथा स्यात्

So that the third case suffix may be used.

अथ द्वितीया सिद्धा ?

Has the use of the second case suffix been sanctioned. ?

सिद्धा Yes, it has been sanctioned.

कथम् ? By which ?

कर्मणि इत्येव Evidently by the *sūtra Karmaṇi dvitīyā*.

तृतीयापि सिद्धा भवति *Tṛtīyā*, too, has been sanctioned.

कथम्? By which?

सुपां सुपो भवन्ति इत्येव By the *vārttika Supām supō bhavanti.*

असत्येतस्मिन् सुपां सुपो भवन्ति इति, तृतीयार्थोऽयमारम्भः - यवाग्वा अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति ।

This *sūtra* was read to sanction *tṛtīyā* before the *vārttika Supām supō bhavanti* was read. Viz. *yavāgvā agnihōtram juhōti*.

एवं तर्हि तृतीयापि सिद्धा If so, *tṛtīyā* too has been sanctioned.

कथम्? How?

कर्तृकरणयोरित्येव । अयमग्निहोत्रशब्दोऽस्त्येव ज्योतिषि वर्तते; तद्यथा अग्निहोत्रं प्रज्वलितम् इति । अस्ति हविषि वर्तते; तद्यथा अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति इति । जुहोतिश्च अस्त्येव प्रक्षेपणे वर्तते, अस्ति प्रीणात्यर्थे वर्तते । तद्यदा तावद् यवागूशब्दात् तृतीया तदा अग्निहोत्रशब्दो ज्योतिषि वर्तते जुहोतिश्च प्रीणात्यर्थे । तद्यथा - यवाग्वा अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति, अग्निं प्रीणाति । यदा यवागूशब्दाद् द्वितीया तदा अग्निहोत्रशब्दो हविषि वर्तते, जुहोतिश्च प्रक्षेपणे; तद्यथा यवागूमग्निहोत्रं जुहोति - यवागूं हविरग्नौ प्रक्षिपति ।

Evidently by the *sūtra Kartṛkaraṇayōs tṛtīyā*. This word *agnihōtra* denotes flame, as in *Agnihōtram prajvalitam*; and denotes offering, as in *Agnihōtram juhōti*. *Hū* in *juhōti* means *to throw* and also *to please*. If *tṛtīyā* is used after *yavāgū*, *agnihōtra* means flame and *juhōti* means pleases, so that *yavāgvā agnihōtram juhōti* means 'he pleases *agni* with *yavāgū*' If *dvitīyā* is used after *yavāgū*, *agnihōtra* means offering and *juhōti* means throws, so that *yavāgūm agnihōtram juhōti* means 'he throws in fire the offering of *yavāgū*'.

NOTE:—*Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* clearly explains how this view differs from that of *Jāimini* regarding *Agnihōtram juhōti.*

अन्तरान्तरेण युक्ते (2, 3, 4)

इह कस्मान्न भवति - किं ते बाभ्रवशालङ्कायनानामन्तरेण गतेन? इति

Why does not the *sūtra* operate here:-*Kim tē Bābhravaśālaṅkāyanānām antarēṇa gatēna?* [1]

लक्षणप्रतिपदोक्तयोः प्रतिपदोक्तस्यैव ग्रहणम् इति ।

On the strength of the *paribhāṣā-Lakṣaṇa-pratipadōktayōḥ pratipadōktasyāiva grahaṇam.*

NOTE:—*Antarēṇa* in the *sūtra* is *nipāta* and hence *pratipadōkta* and that before *gatēna* is the third case of *antara* and hence *lākṣaṇika.*

अथ वा यद्यपि तावद् अयम् अन्तरेणशब्दो दृष्टापचारो निपातश्च अनिपातश्च; अयं तु खल्वन्तराशब्दो अदृष्टापचारः निपात एव । तस्यास्य कोऽन्यो द्वितीयः सहायो भवितुमर्हति अन्यद् अतो निपातात् । तद्यथा अस्य गोर्द्वितीयेनार्थः इति गौरेव आनीयते, नाश्वो न गर्दभः ॥

Or, even though this word *antarēṇa* is found current both as *nipāta* and *anipāta*, this word *antarā* is invariably used only as *nipāta.* Which word other than a *nipāta* can be used in association with it in a sentence? When the sentence *Asya gōr dvitīyēnārthaḥ* (second to this bull is needed), it is the bull and not a horse or a donkey that is brought.

अन्तरान्तरेण युक्तानामप्रधानवचनम्

Reading of *apradhānē* with reference to those in association with *antarā* and *antarēṇa.*

अन्तरान्तरेण युक्तानामप्रधानग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्, अप्रधाने द्वितीया भवतीति वक्तव्यम् - अन्तरा त्वां मां च कमण्डलुः इति, कमण्डलोर्द्वितीया मा भूद् इति

The word *apradhānē* should be read in the *sūtra* as the *viśēṣaṇa* of *antarāntarēṇa yuktē,* so that *dvitīyā* appears after *apradhāna,* as in *Antarā tvām mām ca kamaṇḍaluḥ* and not after *kamaṇḍalu.*

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* says that the meanings of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are *apradhāna,* they being *viśēṣaṇa,* and *kamaṇḍalu* is *pradhāna,* it being *viśēṣya.*

1. It means this:—What do you gain by knowing in detail about *Bābhravaśālaṅkāyanas?*

कः पुनरेताभ्यां कमण्डलोर्योगः ?

Which is the bond connecting these two with *kamaṇḍalu?*

यत्तत् त्वां च मां च अन्तरा तत् कमण्डलोः स्थानम्

The space between you and me is the place for *kamaṇḍalu.*

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It has to be read then.

न वक्तव्यम् No, it need not be read.

कमण्डलोर्द्वितीया कस्मान्न भवति ?

Why will not *dvitīyā* be suffixed to *kamaṇḍalu?*

उपपदविभक्तेः कारकविभक्तिर्बलीयसी इति प्रथमा भविष्यति

Prathamā is suffixed to it on the strength of the *paribhāṣā-Upapadavibhaktēḥ kārakavibhaktir balīyasī.*

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *kamaṇḍalu* takes the nominative singular suffix after it, it being the subject of *asti* (understood).

कालाध्वनोरत्यन्तसंयोगे (2, 3, 5)

अत्यन्तसंयोगे कर्मवल्लाद्यर्थम्

Need to add *karmavat* at the end of the *sūtra* for the sake of *lādi.*

अत्यन्तसंयोगे कालाध्वानौ कर्मवद्भवत इति वक्तव्यम्

There is need to enjoin that *kāla* and *adhvan* behave like *karma* in close association.

किं प्रयोजनम् ? Why ?

लाद्यर्थम् लादिभिरभिधानं यथा स्यात्[1] - आस्यते मासः, शय्यते क्रोशः ।

For the sake of *lakāra*, etc. So that there may be *abhidhāna* by *lakāra* etc. to enable it have *karmaṇi-prayōga* as in *Āsyatē māsaḥ* and *śayyatē krōśaḥ.*

अथ वत्करणं किमर्थम् ? What for is, then, *vat?*

1. *Lādibhirabhihitē dvitīyā mā bhūt* is another reading. This is noted in the *Uddyōta.*

स्वाश्रयमपि यथा स्यात् - आस्यते मासम्, शय्यते क्रोशम् । अकर्मकाणां भावे लो भवति इति भावे लो यथा स्यात् ।

So that the operation based on its original nature also may appear. So that *lakāra* in *bhāvē* may appear in the expressions *Āsyatē māsam* and *śayyatē krōśam* on the strength of *Akarmakāṇām bhāvē lō bhavati.*

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be so enjoined.

न वक्तव्यम् । प्राकृतमेवैतत्कर्म, यथा कटं करोति शकटं, करोतिं इति
It need not be enjoined. The *karma*, here, is only *prakṛta* (i.e.) *īpsitatama*, as in *kaṭam karōti* and *śakaṭam karōti.*

एवं मन्यते, यत्र कश्चित् क्रियाकृतो विशेष उपजायते, तद् न्याय्यं कर्मेति । न चेह कश्चित् क्रियाकृतो विशेष उपजायते ।

Suppose one thinks that the legitimate *karma* is only that which has undergone some modification through *kriyā*. Such a modification is not seen here.

नैवं शक्यम् । इह हि दोषः स्यात् - आदित्यं पश्यति, हिमवन्तं शृणोति, ग्रामं गच्छति इति । तस्मात् प्राकृतमेव एतत्कर्म, यथा कटं करोति शकटं करोति इति
It is not correct to think so; for difficulty will arise here in *Ādityam paśyati, Himavantam śṛṇōti* and *grāmam gacchati* since the objects of the verbs *paśyati, śṛṇōti* and *gacchati* have not undergone any modification. Hence this *karma* is only *prākṛta*, as in *kaṭam karōti* and *śakaṭam karōti.*

यदि तर्हि प्राकृतमेवैतत्कर्म, अकर्मकाणां भावे लो भवति इति भावे लो न प्राप्नोति, आस्यते मासं देवदत्तेन इति
If it is then evidently *prākṛta-karma*, it is not possible for it to have *bhāvē-prayōga* – *Āsyatē māsam Dēvadattēna* on the strength of the statement *akarmakāṇām bhāvē lō bhavati.*

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् The *sūtra* then has to be so modified.

न वक्तव्यम् । अकर्मकाणाम् इत्युच्यते, न च केचिन् कालभावादिभि-रकर्मकास्त एवं विज्ञास्यामः - क्वचिद्ये अकर्मका इति

No, it need not. *Akarmakāṇām* is read in the *sūtra* *Gati-buddhi ....* (1, 4, 52). None is discerned to be *akarmaka* on the basis of *kāla* and *bhāva*; hence we take them to be *akarmakas* on the basis of something else (like *dravya*).

अथ वा येन कर्मणा सकर्मकाश्च अकर्मकाश्च भवन्ति, तेन अकर्मकाणाम्, न चैतेन कर्मणा कश्चिदप्यकर्मकः

Or *akarmakāṇām* refers to those alone which become *sakarmakas* if they take a particular object and *akarmakas* if they do not take it and none is *akarmaka* in its association with *kāla* and *adhvan*.

अथ वा यत्कर्म भवति, न च भवति, तेनाकर्मकाणाम्, न चैतत् कर्म क्वचिदपि न भवति ।

Or *akarmakāṇām* has reference with that alone which sometimes serves as *karma* and which sometimes does not serve as *karma*. Nowhere is *kāla* or *adhvan* not a *karma*.

न तर्हीदानीमिदं सूत्रं वक्तव्यम्

In that case this *sūtra* need not be read.

वक्तव्यं च This has to be read.

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why?

यत्राक्रिययात्यन्तसंयोगस्तदर्थं, क्रोशं कुटिला नदी, क्रोशं रमणीया वनराजिः

It is for the sake of the instances where there is *atyanta-saṁyōga* with reference to *non-kriyā*, as in *krōśam kuṭilā nadī* and *krōśam ramaṇīyā nadī*.

अपवर्गे तृतीया (2, 3, 6)

क्रियापवर्गे

Apavargē, in the *sūtra*, should be replaced by *kriyāpavargē*.

क्रियापवर्ग इति वक्तव्यम्, साधनापवर्गे मा भूत् - मासमधीतो अनुवाकः, न चानेन गृहीतः इति

Kriyāpavargē must be read in the *sūtra*, so that it may not take place when there is *sādhanāpavarga*, as in *Māsam adhītō anuvākaḥ, na ca anēna gṛhītaḥ*. (The *anuvāka* was

studied by him for a month without break, but it is not made his own.)

NOTE :—*Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* explains that *kriyāpavarga* (the end of the effort) takes place only on reaching the fruit aimed at and *sādhanāpavarga* may take place whether the goal is reached or not.

सप्तमीपञ्चम्यौ कारकमध्ये (2, 3 7)

क्रियामध्ये Need to read *kriyāmadhyē.*

क्रियामध्य इति वक्तव्यम्, इहापि यथा स्यात् - अद्य देवदत्तो भुक्त्वा द्व्यहाद् भोक्ता, द्व्यहे भोक्ता । कारकमध्ये इतीयत्युच्यमाने इहैव स्यात् - इहस्थोऽयमिष्वासः क्रोशाल्लक्ष्यं विध्यति, क्रोशे लक्ष्यं विध्यति । यं च विध्यति यतश्च विध्यति उभयोस्तन्मध्यं भवति ।

Kriyāmadhyē has to be read so that the *sūtra* may operate here also—*Adya Dēvadattō bhuktvā dvyahād bhōktā, dvyahē bhōktā*. If it is read *kārakamadhyē*, the *sūtra* will apply only here :- *Ihasthō ayam iṣvāsaḥ krōśād lakṣyam vidhyati, krōśē lakṣyam vidhyati* (Archer strikes at the target at a distance of *krōśa*). *Madhya* is that which is between the target and the place of archer.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It, then, has to be so read.

न वक्तव्यम् ; नान्तरेण साधनं क्रियायाः प्रवृत्तिर्भवति । क्रियामध्यं चेत् कारकमध्यमपि भवति । तत्र कारकमध्ये इत्येव सिद्धम्

No, it need not be so read. *Kriyā* cannot have its course without *kāraka* (*śakti*). *Kriyāmadhya* is possible only in the presence of *kāraka madhya* too. Hence the object is achieved by reading *kārakamadhyē* in the *sūtra.*

कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ते द्वितीया (2, 3, 8)

कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ते प्रत्यादिभिश्च लक्षणादिषूपसङ्ख्यानं सप्तमीपञ्चम्योः प्रतिषेधार्थम्

There is need for the *upasaṅkhyāna* of *karmapravacanīyayuktē prayādibiśca lakṣaṇādiṣu* so that the following forms can be secured :-*vṛkṣam prati vidyōtatē vidyut, vṛkṣam pari vidyōtatē*

vidyut, vṛkṣam anu vidyōtatē vidyut. Sādhur Dēvadattō mātaram prati, Sādhur Dēvadattō mātaram pari, Sādhur Dēvadattō mātaram anu.

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why?

सप्तमीपञ्चम्योः प्रतिषेधार्थम्। सप्तमीपञ्चम्यौ मा भूतामिति, साधुनिपुणाभ्यामर्चायां सप्तमीति सप्तमी, पञ्चम्यपाङ्परिभिरिति पञ्चमी

To prohibit *saptamī* and *pañcamī*. So that *saptamī* and *pañcamī* do not appear there, the *saptamī* being enjoined by *Sādhunipuṇābhyām arcāyām saptamī* (2, 3, 43), and the *pañcamī* being enjoined by *Pañcamyapāṅparibhiḥ* (2, 3, 10)).

तत्रायमप्यर्थः - अप्रतेरिति न वक्तव्यम् भवति

This, too, is an additional benefit that the word *apratēḥ* need not be read (in 2, 3, 43).

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It, then, should be read as a supplement.

न वक्तव्यम्। उक्तं वा No, it need not. It has been answered.

किमुक्तम् How has it been answered?

एकत्र तावदुक्तम् अप्रतेरिति। इतरत्रापि यद्यपि तावदयं परिः दृष्टापचारो वर्जने चावर्जने च, अयं खल्वपशब्दोऽदृष्टापचारो वर्जनार्थ एव। तस्य कोऽन्यो द्वितीयः सहायो भवितुमर्हति अन्यदतो वर्जनार्थात्। तद्यथा अस्य गोर्द्वितीयेनार्थ इति गौरेव आनीयते, नाश्वो न गर्दभः॥

Prati in *apratēḥ* in 2, 3, 43 is taken as *upalakṣaṇa*. Even though this *pari* is used sometimes in the sense of *varjana* and sometimes in the sense of *avarjana*, this *apa* is invariably used in the sense of *varjana*. Which else can be associated with it (*apa*) other than that which has the meaning of *varjana*? When it is said that one needs an associate to a bull, a bull alone is brought and neither a horse nor a donkey[1].

यस्मादधिकं यस्य चेश्वरवचनं तत्र सप्तमी (2, 3, 9)

कथमिदं विज्ञायते - यस्य च ऐश्वर्यं ईश्वरता ईश्वरभावः तस्मात् कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ताद् इति, आहोस्विद् यस्य स्वस्य ईश्वरः तस्मात् कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ताद् इति?

1. *Cf.* Vol. IV p. 277.

How is this – *yasya īśvaravacanam tatra*—to be interpreted, 'after that which is *karmapravacanīyayukta* and which is endowed with *īśvaratā* (lordship)' or 'after that which is *karmapravacanīyayukta* and which has a lord over it'?

कश्चात्र विशेषः? What is the difference here?

यस्य चेश्वरवचनमिति कर्तृनिर्देशश्चेदवचनात् सिद्धम्

If the stem *yad* in *yasya* refers to the lord, the object is achieved without this *sūtra*.

यस्य चेश्वरवचनमिति कर्तृनिर्देशश्चेत् अन्तरेण वचनं सिद्धम् – अधिब्रह्मदत्ते पञ्चालाः, आधृतास्ते तस्मिन् भवन्ति

If *yad* in *yasya* refers to the lord, the object is achieved without the *sūtra*. In the expression *Adhi Brahmadattē Pañcālāḥ*, he becomes *ādhāra* and they become *ādhēya* (and seventh case after *Brahmadatta* is secured by *saptamyadhikaraṇē ca* 2, 3, 36).

सत्यमेवमेतत् – नित्यं परिग्रहीतव्यं परिग्रहीत्रधीनं भवति

It is certainly so that subjects are always under the lord.

प्रथमानुपपत्तिस्तु The impropriety of *prathamā* also.

प्रथमा नोपपद्यते

It is not proper to have nominative case-suffix.

कुतः? After what?

पञ्चालेभ्यः After the word *pañcāla*.

का तर्हि स्यात्? Which case-suffix will then be?

षष्ठीसप्तम्यौ, स्वामीश्वराधिपती दायाद .... इति

The sixth and seventh case-suffixes will appear on the strength of the *sūtra Svāmīśvarādhipati* ... (2, 3, 39).

न तत्र अधिशब्दः पठ्यते The word *adhi* is not read there.

यद्यपि न पठ्यते, अधिरीश्वरवाची

Even though it is not read, the word *adhi* means *īśvara*.

न तत्र पर्यायवचनानां ग्रहणं भवति

The synonyms of words read there are not taken as targets.

कथं ज्ञायते ? How is it known ?

यदयं कस्यचित् पर्यायवचनस्य ग्रहणं करोति - अधिपतिदायादेति
Since he (*Sūtrakāra*) reads certain synonyms like *svāmī*, *īśvara*, *adhipati* etc. together (in 2, 3, 39).

षष्ठी तर्हि प्राप्नोति If so, *ṣaṣṭhī* may set in.

शेषलक्षणा षष्ठी, अशेषत्वान्न भविष्यति
Ṣaṣṭhī is with reference to *śēṣa* and since there is no *śēṣatva*, it may not appear.

द्वितीया तर्हि प्राप्नोति - कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ते द्वितीया इति
If so, *dvitīyā* may set in by *Karmapravacanīyayuktē dvitīyā*.

सप्तम्योक्तत्वात्तस्यार्थस्य द्वितीया न भविष्यति
Since that meaning is expressed by *saptamī*, *dvitīyā* has no chance.

भवेद्योऽधेर्ब्रह्मदत्तस्य चाभिसम्बन्धः स सप्तम्योक्तः स्याद्, यस्तु खलु अधेः पञ्चालानां चाभिसम्बन्धः तत्र द्वितीया प्राप्नोति ।
If *adhi* is related to *Brahmadatta*, it may be expressed by *saptamī* ; but if it is related to *Pañcāla*, *dvitīyā* may set in.

स्ववचनात्तु सिद्धम्

The object is achieved by taking the stem in *yasya* refer to *sva*.

अस्तु - यस्य स्वस्य, ईश्वरः तस्मात् कर्मप्रचनीययुक्तादिति
Let the *sūtra* be taken to mean thus :—*yasya* = *svasya*, *īśvara-vacanam* = *īśvaraḥ*, *tatra* = *tasmāt karmapravacanīyayuktāt*, *saptamī* (*bhavati*).

एवमप्यन्तरेण वचनं सिद्धम् । अधि ब्रह्मदत्तः पञ्चालेषु । आधारः स तेषु भवति
Even then the object is achieved without the *sūtra*. In *Adhi Brahmadattaḥ pañcālēṣu*, *Brahmadatta* becomes the *ādhāra* with reference to *Pañcālas*.

सत्यमेवमेतत् - नित्यं परिग्रहीता परिग्रहीतव्याधीनो भवति ।
It is evidently true that the lord is dependent upon his subjects.

प्रथमानुपपत्तिस्तु The impropriety of *prathamā* also.

प्रथमा तु नोपपद्यते *Prathamā* is not proper.

कुतः? After which?

ब्रह्मदत्तात् After *Brahmadatta*.

का तर्हि स्यात् What, then, will apear?

षष्ठीसप्तम्यौ - स्वामीश्वराधिपतीति
Ṣaṣṭhī and *saptamī* will appear on the strength of the *sūtra* *Svāmīśvarādhipati* .... (2, 3, 39).

न तत्राधिशब्दः पठ्यते The word *adhi* is not read in that *sūtra*.

यद्यपि न पठ्यते, अधिरीश्वरवाची
Though *adhi* is not read, it is a synonym of *īśvara*.

न तत्र पर्यायवचनानां ग्रहणं भवति
Synonyms of the words read there are not operated upon.

कथं ज्ञायते? On which authority is it so taken?

यदयं कस्यचित् पर्यायवचनस्य ग्रहणं करोति अधिपतिदायादेति
Since he reads certain synonyms like *svāmī*, *īśvaraḥ* and *adhipatiḥ* in the *sūtra*.

षष्ठी तर्हि प्राप्नोति If so, *ṣaṣṭhī* may set in.

शेषलक्षणा षष्ठी, अशेषत्वान्न भविष्यति
Ṣaṣṭhī is with reference to *śēṣa* and it will not set in on account of the absence of *śēṣatva*.

द्वितीया तर्हि प्राप्नोति - कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ते द्वितीया इति
Dvitīyā, then, will appear on the strength of the *sūtra* *Karmapravacanīyayuktē dvitīyā*.

सप्तम्योक्तत्वात्तस्याभिसम्बन्धस्य द्वितीया न भविष्यति
Since the *sambandha* is expressed by *saptamī*, *dvitīyā* does not appear.

भवेद्योऽधेः पञ्चालानां चाभिसम्बन्धः स सप्तम्योक्तः स्यात्, यस्तु खलु अधेः ब्रह्मदत्तस्य चाभिसम्बन्धः तत्र द्वितीया प्राप्नोति

If *adhi* is related to *pañcāla*, it will be expressed by *saptamī*, but if *adhi* is related to *Brahmadatta*, it will get *dvitīyā*.

एवं तर्हि स्ववचनात्तु सिद्धम् इति

If so, the object is evidently achieved by reading *svē* in place of *īśvarē* in the *sūtra Adhir-īśvarē*.

अधिः स्वं प्रति कर्मप्रवचनीयसंज्ञो भवति इति वक्तव्यम्

It must be read that *adhi* becomes *karmapravacanīya* with reference to *sva*.

एवमपि यदा ब्रह्मदत्ते अधिकरणे सप्तमी तदा पञ्चालेभ्यो द्वितीया प्राप्नोति

Even then if *adhikaraṇa-saptamī* follows *Brahmadatta*, *dvitīyā* will follow *Pañcāla*.

कथम् ? On the strength of which *sūtra* ?

कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ते द्वितीया इति

On the strength of the *sūtra Karmapravacanīyayuktē dvitīyā*.

उपपदविभक्तेः कारकविभक्तिर्बलीयसी इति प्रथमा भविष्यति ।

Prathamā follows it on the strength of the *paribhāṣā—Upapadavibhaktēḥ kārakavibhaktir balīyasī*.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that the nominative case-suffix which is *kārakavibhakti* follows *pañcāla*, since verbs like *tiṣṭhanti santi* etc. are understood after it.

गत्यर्थकर्मणि द्वितीयाचतुर्थ्यौ चेष्टायामनध्वनि (2, 3, 12)

अध्वन्यर्थग्रहणम्

Need to read *Anadhvanyarthē* in place of *anadhvani*.

अध्वन्यर्थग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । इह मा भूत्, पन्थानं गच्छति, वीवधं गच्छति इति ।

It is necessary to read *adhvanyartha* in place of *adhvan*, so that the fourth-case suffix may not appear after *pathi* and *vīvadha* in *Panthānam gacchati* and *vīvadham gacchati*.

आस्थितप्रतिषेधश्च

Also the *pratiṣēdha* is with reference to the used one.

अस्थितप्रतिषेधश्चायं वक्तव्यः । यो हि उत्पथेन पन्थानं गच्छति, पथे गच्छति इत्येव तत्र भवितव्यम्

It must be said that the *pratiṣēdha* holds good only to the used way or path. *Pathē gacchati* is certainly to be read with reference to one who reaches the used road through a wrong one.

किमर्थं पुनरिदमुच्यते ? Why is this *sūtra* read ?

चतुर्थी यथा स्यात् So that *caturthī* may set in there.

अथ द्वितीया सिद्धा ? Has *dvitīyā* been secured ?

सिद्धा, कर्मणि इत्येव

It is secured evidently by the *sūtra Karmaṇi dvitīyā*.

चतुर्थ्यपि सिद्धा *Caturthī*, too, is secured.

कथम् ? How ?

सम्प्रदाने इत्येव Certainly by the *sūtra Sampradānē caturthī*.

न सिध्यति । कर्मणा यमभिप्रैति स सम्प्रदानम् इत्युच्यते, क्रियया चासौ ग्राममभिप्रैति ।

No, it cannot be secured by that *sūtra*, since *karmaṇā abhiprāyaṇam* is read there and here he aims at *grāma* through *kriyā*.

कया क्रियया ? By which *kriyā* ?

गमिक्रियया By the act of going.

क्रियाग्रहणमपि तत्र चोद्यते

The need for reading *kriyā* also was discussed there (in 1, 4, 32)

NOTE :—But *kriyāgrahaṇa* was *pratyākhyāta* there.

चेष्टायामनध्वनि स्त्रियं गच्छत्यजां नयतीत्यतिप्रसङ्गः

There will be *ativyāpti* of *cēṣṭāyām anadhvani* in *striyam gacchati* and *ajām nayati*.

चेष्टायमनध्वनि स्त्रियं गच्छति अजां नयति इत्यतिप्रसङ्गो भवति

There will be *atiprasaṅga* of *cēṣṭāyām anadhvani* in *striyam gacchati* and *ajām nayati*.

सिद्धं त्वसम्प्राप्तवचनात्
The object is achieved by reading *asamprāpta* (in place of *gatyartha*).

सिद्धमेतत् The object is achieved.

कथम्? How?

असम्प्राप्ते कर्मणि द्वितीयाचतुर्थ्यौ भवत इति वक्तव्यम्
The *sūtra* must be modified thus :—*Asamprāptē karmaṇi dvitīyā-caturthyāu bhavataḥ*.

अध्वनश्चानपवादः No need for the *apavāda*, *anadhvani*

एवं च कृत्वा अनध्वनि इत्येदपि न वक्तव्यं भवति । सम्प्राप्तं ह्येतत्कर्म अध्वानं गच्छति इति
On this understanding the word *anadhvani* too need not be read in the *sūtra*. The *adhvan* which is *karma* in *Adhvānam gacchati* is *samprāpta*.

चतुर्थी सम्प्रदाने (2, 3, 13)

चतुर्थीविधाने तादर्थ्य उपसङ्ख्यानं
Need to add *tādarthyē* in the *caturthī-vidhāyaka-sūtra*.

चतुर्थीविधाने तादर्थ्ये उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - यूपाय दारु, कुण्डलाय हिरण्यम् इति
There is need to add *tādarthyē* in the *sūtra* enjoining *caturthī* viz. *Yūpāya dāru*, and *kuṇḍalāya hiraṇyam*.

Note :—*Kāiyaṭa* states that *tad* in *tādarthyē* refers to *kārya*.

किमिदं तादर्थ्यम्? What is this – *tādarthya* ?

तदर्थस्य भावः तादर्थ्यम् *Tādarthya* means *tadarthasya bhāvaḥ*.

तदर्थं पुनः किम्? What then is this – *tadartham* ?

सर्वनाम्नोयं चतुर्थ्यन्तस्य अर्थ शब्देन सह समासः

This is the compound of the demonstrative pronoun in the fourth case with the word *artha.*

कथं चात्र चतुर्थी On what authority is *caturthī* used here?

अनेनैव Evidently by this *vārttika*

यद्येवम् इतरेतराश्रयं भवति If so, there is interdependence.

का इतरेतराश्रयता ? Of what nature is *itaretarāśrayatā* ?

निर्देशोत्तरकालं चतुर्थ्या भवितव्यं, चतुर्थ्या च निर्देशः, तदेतद् इतरेतराश्रयं भवति । इतरेतराश्रयाणि च कार्याणि न प्रकल्पन्ते

Caturthī must set in after this *vārttika* is read and this word *tādarthyam* can be used after there is chance for *caturthī.* This is interdependence. Deeds which are interdependent are not accomplished.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम्

Another *vidhi* enjoining the fourth case must then be read.

न वक्तव्यम् । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति - भवति हि अर्थशब्देन योगे चतुर्थीति, यदयं चतुर्थी तदर्थार्थेति चतुर्थ्यन्तस्य अर्थशब्देन सह समासं शास्ति

No, it need not be read. The procedure of *Ācārya* (*Sūtrakāra*) suggests that *caturthī* sets in after a word which is in association with the word *artha,* since he enjoins *samāsa* between a word ending in the fourth case and the word *artha* in the *sūtra Caturthī tadarthārthabali* ... (2, 1, 36).

न खल्वप्यवश्यं चतुर्थ्यन्तस्यैव अर्थशब्देन सह समासो भवति

It is not absolutely necessary that only a word in the fourth case can form a compound with the word *artha,*

किं तर्हि ? What then ?

षष्ठ्यन्तस्यापि भवति । तद्यथा गुरोरिदं गुर्वर्थम् इति

A word in the sixth case also does it, as *gurōḥ idam* compounds into *gurvartham.*

NOTE :—*Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* states that this argument proves the absence of interdependence.

यदि तादर्थ्ये उपसङ्ख्यानं क्रियते, नार्थः सम्प्रदानग्रहणेन । यो ह्युपाध्यायाय गौर्दीयते उपाध्यायार्थः स भवति, तत्र तादर्थ्ये इत्येव सिद्धम्

If *Tādarthyē upasaṅkhyānam* is read, no purpose is served by reading *sampradānē* in the *sūtra*. The cow that is given to *upādhyāya* becomes *upādhyāyārtha* and *caturthī* is secured after *upādhyāya* on the strength of *tādarthyē*.

अवश्यं सम्प्रदानग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् - यान्येन लक्षणेन सम्प्रदानसंज्ञा, तदर्थम्, छात्राय रुचितं, छात्राय स्वदितम् इति ।

There is absolute need for reading *sampradānē* for the sake of those which take *sampradānasaṁjñā* through other *sūtras* (like *Rucyarthānām prīyamāṇāḥ*), so that expressions *chātrāya rucitam*, and *chātrāya svaditam* may be secured.

तर्हि उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम्

It is then necessary to read the *upasaṅkhyāna*.

न कर्तव्यम् । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति - भवति हि तादर्थ्ये चतुर्थीति, यदयं चतुर्थी तदर्थार्थेति चतुर्थ्यन्तस्य तदर्थेन सह समासं शास्ति

No, it need not be read. *Ācārya-pravṛtti* suggests that there is *caturthī* in *tādarthya*, since he enjoins *samāsa* of *caturthyanta* with *artha* in the *sūtra Caturthī tadarthārtha* ... (2, 1, 36).

क्लृपि सम्पद्यमाने

In association with *kḷp* in the sense of transformation.

क्लृपि सम्पद्यमाने चतुर्थी वक्तव्या - मूत्राय कल्पते यवागूः, उच्चाराय कल्पते यवान्नम् इति ।

There is need to enjoin *caturthī* in association with *kḷp* meaning to transform. Viz. *Mūtrāya kalpatē yavāgūḥ* and *uccārāya kalpatē yavānnam*.

उत्पातेन ज्ञाप्यमाने After what is suggested by *utpāta*.

उत्पातेन ज्ञाप्यमाने चतुर्थी वक्तव्या -

वाताय कपिला विद्युदातपायातिलोहिनी ।

कृष्णा सर्वविनाशाय दुर्भिक्षाय सिता भवेत् ॥

मांसौदनाय व्याहरति मृगः

There is need to use the fourth case after what is suggested by unforeseen occurrences. Viz.

Vātāya kapilā vidyut (Lightning in *kapila* colour for heavy wind)
Ātapāya atilōhinī (Deep red lightning forebodes extreme heat)
Kṛṣṇā sarvavināśāya (Black lightning forebodes entire destruction)
Durbhikṣāya sitā bhavēt (White lightning forebodes famine).
Māṁsāudanāya vyāharati mṛgaḥ (Deer cries foreboding death).

हितयोगे च In association with the word *hita* also.

हितयोगे चतुर्थी वक्तव्या – हितमरोचकिने, हितमामयाविने

Caturthī has to be enjoined to that which is in association with the word *hita* too, as in *Hitam arōcakinē* and *Hitam āmayāvinē*.

नमः स्वस्तिस्वाहास्वधालंवषड्योगाच्च (2, 3, 16)

स्वस्तियोगे चतुर्थी कुशलार्थैराशिषि वा विधानात्

Caturthī alone in association with *svasti* on account of *vibhāṣā* in *kuśalārtha* and *āśis*.

स्वस्तियोगे चतुर्थी कुशलार्थैराशिषि वा विधानाद्भवति विप्रतिषेधेन

Caturthī alone is used in association with *svasti* by *pūrva-vipratiṣēdha*, since either *caturthī* or *ṣaṣṭhī* is enjoined with reference to *kuśalārtha* and *āśis* in the *sūtra* *Caturthī cāśiṣi* ... (2, 3, 73).

स्वस्तियोगे चतुर्थ्या अवकाशः – स्वस्ति जाल्माय, स्वस्ति वृषलाय ; कुशलार्थैराशिषि वाविधानस्य अवकाशः – अन्ये कुशलार्थाः – कुशलं देवदत्ताय, कुशलं देवदत्तस्य ; इहोभयं प्राप्नोति – स्वस्ति गोभ्यः, स्वस्ति ब्राह्मणेभ्यः इति ; चतुर्थी भवति विप्रतिषेधेन

Room for the use of *caturthī* in association with *svasti* is *svasti jālmāya* and *svasti vṛṣalāya ;* room for the application of *kuśalārthāir āśiṣi vāvidhānam* is *kuśalam Dēvadattāya* and *kuśalam Dēvadattasya*, the others *āyuṣya*, *bhadram* etc. being *kuśalārthas* ; both have a chance to operate here and *caturthī*

takes place in preference to *vibhāṣā* by *pūrvavipratiṣēdha* :- *svasti gōbhyaḥ* and *svasti brāhmaṇēbhyaḥ*.

अलमिति पर्याप्त्यर्थग्रहणम्

There is need to enjoin that *alam* in the *sūtra* means *paryāpti* (sufficiency).

अलमिति पर्याप्त्यर्थग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्; इह मा भूत् - अलंकुरुते कन्याम् इति । अपर आह - अलमिति पर्याप्त्यर्थग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्; इहापि यथा स्यात् - अलं मल्लो मल्लाय, प्रभुर्मल्लो मल्लाय, प्रभवति मल्लो मल्लाय इति

The word *alam* should be taken to 'suggest sufficiency, to prevent the fourth case in *Alaṅkurutē kanyām*. Another says that *alam* in the *sūtra* should be said to have *paryāptyartha*, so that the fourth case may be used in the following cases also :-*Alam mallō mallāya*; *prabhur mallō mallāya* and *prabhavati mallō mallāya*.

मन्यकर्मण्यनादरे विभाषाऽप्राणिषु (2, 3, 17)

अप्राणिष्वित्युच्यते । तत्रेदं न सिध्यति - न त्वा श्वानं मन्ये, न त्वा शुने मन्ये इति

Aprāṇiṣu is read in the *sūtra*. Hence the following is not possible to be secured :- *Na tvā śvānam manyē*, and *Na tvā śunē manyē*.

एवं तर्हि योगविभागः करिष्यते - मन्यकर्मण्यनादरे विभाषा, ततः अप्राणिषु - अप्राणिषु च विभाषेति ।

If so, the *sūtra* is split into two thus :-*Manyakarmaṇyanādarē vibhāṣā* and *Aprāṇiṣu*. *Vibhāṣā* is taken to *Aprāṇiṣu* also by *anuvṛtti*.

इहापि तर्हि प्राप्नोति - न त्वा काकं मन्ये, न त्वा शुकं मन्ये इति

It will, then, operate even here (by the first *sūtra*) :-*Na tvā kākam manyē*, and *Na tvā śukam manyē*.

यदेतद् अप्राणिष्विति, एतद् अनावादिष्विति वक्ष्यामि

I shall qualify *aprāṇiṣu* by *anāvādiṣu*.

इमे च नावादयो भविष्यन्ति - न त्वा नावं मन्ये यावत्तीर्णं न नाव्यम्. न त्वा अन्नं मन्ये यावद्भुक्तं न श्राद्धमिति ।

These will come under *nāvādis*:–*Na tvā nāvam manyē yāvat tīrṇam na nāvyam.* (Since you have not crossed the sea, I do not consider you to be a ship). *Na tvā annam manyē yāvad bhuktam na śrāddham* (I do not consider you to be food since you have not been eaten in a *śrāddha*).

अत्र येषु प्राणिषु नेष्यते ते नावादयो भविष्यन्ति

Those, among *prāṇis*, which are not wanted here may be taken under *nāvādis.*

मन्यकर्मणि प्रकृष्यकुत्सितग्रहणम्

Anādarē in the *sūtra* should be replaced by *prakṛṣyakutsitē.*

मन्यकर्मणि प्रकृष्यकुत्सितग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् - इह मा भूत् - त्वां तृणं मन्य इति

The word *prakṛṣyakutsitē* should be read with reference to *manyakarma*, so that the *sūtra* may not operate here:–*Tvām tṛṇam manyē.*

NOTE:— *Vārttikakāra* wishes to replace *anādarē* by *prakṛṣyakutsitē* and *Mahābhāṣyakāra* wishes to qualify *aprāṇiṣu* by *anāvādiṣu.*

Āhnika – Twentyfour ends.

(Second *adhyāya*, third *pāda*, first *āhnika* ends.

Āhnika — Twentyfive

(Second adhyāya, third pāda, second āhnika)

कर्तृकरणयोस्तृतीया (2, 3, 18)

ीयाविधाने प्रकृत्यादिभ्य उपसङ्ख्यानम्

akṛtyādibhyaḥ is to be added in the *tṛtīyāvidhāyakasūtra*.

तृतीयाविधाने प्रकृत्यादिभ्य उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - प्रकृत्या अभिरूपः, ृत्या दर्शनीयः ; प्रायेण याज्ञिकाः, प्रायेण वैयाकरणाः ; माठरोऽस्मि गोत्रेण, र्ग्योऽस्मि गोत्रेण ; समेन धावति, विषमेण धावति ; द्विद्रोणेन धान्यं क्रीणाति ; द्रोणेन क्रीणाति ; पञ्चकेन पशून् क्रीणाति, सहस्रेण अश्वान् क्रीणाति ।

here is need to add *prakṛtyādibhyaḥ* to allow the third case fter *prakṛti* etc. as in *prakṛtyā abhirūpaḥ* (one who is beautiful y nature); *prakṛtyā darśanīyaḥ* (one who is fine by nature ɔ look at); *prāyēṇa yājñikāḥ* (mostly *yājñikas*), *prāyēṇa* *āiyākaraṇāḥ ; Māṭharōsmi gōtrēṇa* (I belong to *Māṭharagōtra*), *ārgyōsmi gōtrēṇa ; Samēna dhāvati* (he runs evenly), *viṣamēṇa* *hāvati* (he runs unevenly); *Dvidrōṇēna dhānyam krīṇāti* ; he buys two *drōṇās* of corn), *tridrōṇēna dhānyam krīṇāti* ; *Pañcakēna paśūn krīṇāti* (he buys goats by fives), *sahasrēṇa* *aśvān krīṇāti* (he buys horses by thousands.)

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that, otherwise, sixth case may appear after *prakṛti*, first case after *prāya*, first or sixth case after *gōtra* ; second case after *sama*, *dvidrōṇa* and *pañcaka*.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It has to be read then.

न वक्तव्यम् । कर्तृकरणयोस्तृतीया इत्येव सिद्धम्

No, it need not be read. The object is achieved by *kartṛkaraṇayōs tṛtīyā* itself.

इह तावत्, प्रकृत्या अभिरूपः, प्रकृत्या दर्शनीय इति, प्रकृतिकृतं तस्य आभिरूप्यम्

Firstly with reference to *prakṛtyā abhirūpaḥ* and *prakṛtyā darśanīyaḥ*, his *ābhirūpya* is got through this *prakṛti*.

प्रायेण याज्ञिकाः, प्रायेण वैयाकरणाः इति, एष तत्र प्रायो येन तेऽधीयते

With reference to *Prāyēṇa yājñikāḥ* and *prāyēṇa vāiyākaraṇāḥ*, it is *bahula* there, and it is the *karaṇa* of their study.

NOTE :— *Kāiyaṭa* reads :-*Prāya iti :- bāhulyam ityarthaḥ. Tacca adhyayanasya karaṇatvēna vivakṣitam.*

माठरोऽस्मि गोत्रेण, गार्ग्योऽस्मि गोत्रेण इति, एतेन अहं संज्ञाये

With reference to *Māṭharōsmi gōtrēṇa* and *Gārgyōsmi gōtrēṇa*. I am known by this.

समेन धावति, विषमेण धावति इति, इदमत्र प्रयोक्तव्यं सन्न प्रयुज्यते, समेन पथा धावति, विषमेण पथा धावति इति ।

With reference to *Samēna dhāvati* and *viṣamēṇa dhāvati* this (*pathā*) is to be read there, but is not read :-and hence they stand for *samēna pathā dhāvati* and *viṣamēṇa pathā dhāvati.*

द्विद्रोणेन धान्यं क्रीणाति, त्रिद्रोणेन धान्यं क्रीणाति इति, तादर्थ्यात् ताच्छब्द्यम । द्विद्रोणार्थं द्विद्रोणं, द्विद्रोणेन हिरण्येन धान्यं क्रीणाति इति ।

With reference to *Dvidrōṇēna dhānyam krīṇāti,* the word is used in the sense of what it is intended for.

NOTE :—*Dvidrōṇa* means for the sake of *dvidrōṇa* and hence the sentence means he buys with money to secure two *drōṇas* of corn.

पञ्चकेन पशून् क्रीणाति इति, अत्रापि तादर्थ्यात् ताच्छब्द्यम् - पञ्चपश्वर्थः पञ्चकः, पञ्चकेन पशून् क्रीणातीति

With reference to *Pañcakēna paśūn krīṇāti*, here too the word is used in *tadartha. Pañcakaḥ* means *pañcapaśvarthaḥ*. Hence is the expression *Pañcakēna paśūn krīṇāti.*

साहस्रेण अश्वान् क्रीणाति इति, सहस्रपरिमाणं साहस्रं, साहस्रेण हिरण्येन अश्वान् क्रीणाति इति ।

With reference to *Sāhasrēṇa aśvān krīṇāti, sāhasram* means *sahasra-parimāṇam* and hence it means that he buys horses with gold sufficient to purchase thousand.

सहयुक्तेऽप्रधाने (2, 3, 19)

किमुदाहरणम् ? What is the example ?

तिलैः सह माषान् वपति इति

Tilāiḥ saha māṣān vapati. (He sows black gram with gingilly seed).

नैतदस्ति[1] ; तिलैः मिश्रीकृत्य माषा उप्यन्ते तत्र करणे इत्येव सिद्धम् ।

No, it cannot serve as the example. Black *māṣa* mixed with *tila* is sown and hence *tṛtīyā* may be used there on the strength of *karaṇē* (in the *sūtra Kartṛkaraṇayōs tṛtīyā*).

इदं तर्हि पुत्रेण सहागतो देवदत्तः इति ; अप्रधाने कर्तरि तृतीया यथा स्यात्

If so, this may serve as the example – *Putrēṇa saha āgatō Dēvadattaḥ*, so that *tṛtīyā* may be used with reference to *apradhāna-kartṛ*.

एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम् । प्रधाने कर्तरि लादयो भवन्तीति प्रधानकर्ता क्तेन अभिधीयते, यश्च अप्रधानं सिद्धा तत्र कर्तरीत्येव तृतीया

This too does not serve as *prayōjana* to the *sūtra*. *Pradhāna-kartā* is expressed by *kta* in *gata* on the maxim that *lakārādis* are used only with reference to the *pradhānakartṛ* and *tṛtīyā* is secured here by *kartari* with reference to *apradhānakartṛ*.

इदं तर्हि - पुत्रेण सहागमनं देवदत्तस्य इति

If so, let this be the example – *Putrēṇa saha āgamanam Dēvadattasya*.

षष्ठ्यत्र बाधिका भविष्यति *Ṣaṣṭhī* may veto this.

NOTE :– *Kāiyaṭa* reads –*Kartṛkarmaṇōḥ kṛti ityanēna sā ca pradhānayōr ēva kartṛkarmaṇōḥ prādhānyād ēva smaryatē iti apradhānē kartari na bhaviṣyati.*

इदं तर्हि - पुत्रेण सह स्थूलः, पुत्रेण सह पिङ्गल इति

If so, let this be the example :–*Putrēṇa saha sthūlaḥ, putrēṇa saha piṅgalaḥ.*

1. This is not found in Bombay edition.

इदं चाप्युदाहरणम् - तिलैः सह माषान् वपति इति

This, too, may be taken as the example—*Tilāiḥ saha māṣān vapati.*

ननु चोक्तं - तिलैर्मिश्रीकृत्य माषा उप्यन्ते तत्र करण इत्येव सिद्धम् इति

Oh, it was said that *tṛtīyā* is secured on the strength of *karaṇē,* since black gram mixed with gingelly is sown.

भवेत्सिद्धं यदा तिलैर्मिश्रीकृत्योप्येरन् । यदा तु खलु कस्य चिन्माषबीजावाप उपस्थितः, तदर्थं च क्षेत्रमुपार्जितं, तत्रान्यदपि किञ्चिदुप्यते, यदि भविष्यति भविष्यति इति तदा न सिध्यति

It is secured if black gram mixed with gingelly is sown. But, if it was the time for black gram to be sown, if the land is made ready for it and it is sown and if, afterwards, something other than that (say gingelly) is sown with the idea "If it chances to be fruitful, let it be", it cannot be secured.

सहयुक्तेऽप्रधानवचनमनर्थकमुपपदविभक्तेः कारकविभक्तिबलीयस्त्वाद् अन्यत्रापि

No purpose is served by reading the *sūtra Sahayuktēspradhānē* on account of *kārakavibhakti* overruling the *upapadavibhakti* here as elsewhere.

सहयुक्तेऽप्रधानवचनमनर्थकम्

It is needless to read *Sahayuktēspradhānē.*

किं कारणम्? Why?

उपपदविभक्तेः कारकविभक्तिबलीयस्त्वात् । अन्यत्रापि उपपदविभक्तेः कारकविभक्तिर्बलीयसी इति प्रथमा भवति, एवमत्रापि उपपदविभक्तेः कारकविभक्तिर्बलीयसी इति प्रथमा भविष्यति

On account of *kārakavibhakti* overruling *upapadavibhakti. Prathamā* sets in elsewhere on the strength of the dictum-*Upapadavibhaktēḥ kārakavibhaktir balīyasī.* So also *prathamā* will set in here on the strength of the dictum *Upapadavibhaktēḥ kārakavibhaktir balīyasī.*

क्वान्यत्र To which does *anyatra* refer?

गाः स्वामी व्रजति इति In the sentence *Gāḥ svāmī vrajati.*

NOTE :— The *upapadavibhakti* - *ṣaṣṭhī* or *saptamī* is enjoined to *gō* by the *sūtra Svāmīśvara* .... (2, 3, 39) and the *kārakavibhakti* - *dvitīyā* - is enjoined by *Karmaṇi dvitīyā*. The latter overrules the former.

येनाङ्गविकारः (2, 3, 20)

इह कस्मान्न भवति - अक्षि काणम् अस्य इति ?

Why does not *tṛtīyā* set in here (after *kāṇa*) in *Akṣi kāṇam asya* ?

अङ्गाद्विकृतात्तद्विकारतश्चेदङ्गिनो वचनम्

It must be enjoined after the deformed *aṅga* in case the defect serves to denote the *aṅgin*.

अङ्गाद् विकृतात् तृतीया वक्तव्या, तेनैव चेद् विकारेण अङ्गी द्योत्यते इति वक्तव्यम्

It (*tṛtīyā*) must be enjoined after the word denoting the deformed limb, if it alone serves to denote the whole.

तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be so read.

न वक्तव्यम् । अङ्गशब्दोऽयं समुदायशब्दः ; येनेति च करणे एषा तृतीया । येनावयवेन समुदायोऽङ्गी द्योत्यते तस्मिन् भवितव्यम् । न चैतेनावयवेन समुदायो द्योत्यते

No, it need not be so read. This word *aṅga* in the *sūtra* means *aṅgin* ; *tṛtīyā* in *yēna* has *karaṇatva* for its *artha*. Hence the *sūtra* means that *tṛtīyā* should be used after that *aṅga-vācaka* by which deformity *aṅgin* is suggested. *Aṅgin* is not suggested by the *aṅga* here (in the expression *akṣi kāṇam asya*).

NOTE :—1. *Kāiyaṭa* derives *aṅga* thus :—*Aṅgāni asya santi*.

NOTE :—2. *Vārttikakāra* suggests modification of the *sūtra* and *Mahābhāṣyakāra* does not want it.

इत्थंभूतलक्षणे (2, 3, 21)

इत्थंभूतलक्षणे तत्स्थे प्रतिषेधः

Prohibition if *ittham-bhūta-lakṣaṇa* is in *lakṣya-vāci-śabda*.

इत्थंभूतलक्षणे तत्स्थे प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - अपि भवान् कमण्डलुपाणिं छात्रमद्राक्षीत् इति ।

There is need to prohibit *tṛtīyā* after *ittham-bhūta-lakṣaṇa* if the same is in *lakṣya-vāci-śabda*, as in *Api bhavān kamaṇḍalupāṇim chātram adrākṣīt*? (Did you see the pupil having *kamaṇḍalu* in his hand?)

NOTE:—*Kamaṇḍalupāṇi* is *lakṣyavācaka* and *kamaṇḍalu* is *itthambhūtalakṣaṇa-vācaka*.

न चेत्थंभूतस्य लक्षणेनापृथग्भावात्

No, it is not necessary on account of the *lakṣya* of this nature not being separated from the *lakṣaṇa*.

न वा वक्तव्यम् It is not necessary.

किं कारणम्? Why?

इत्थंभूतस्य लक्षणेनऽपृथग्भावात् - यत्रेत्थम्भूतस्य पृथग्भूतं लक्षणं तत्र भवितव्यम्। न चात्र इत्थंभूतस्य पृथग्भूतं लक्षणम्

On account of the *lakṣya* of this nature not being separated from *lakṣaṇa*. It (third case) will appear if *lakṣya* of this nature has its *lakṣaṇa* separated from it. But here the *lakṣya* of this nature does not have the *lakṣaṇa* separated from it.

किं वक्तव्यमेतत्? Is this to be so explained?

न हि No, it need not.

कथमनुच्यमानं गंस्यते

How will it be known without the explanation?

तथा ह्ययं प्राधान्येन लक्षणं प्रतिनिर्दिशति, इत्थंभूतस्य लक्षणम् इत्थंभूतलक्षणं तस्मिन् इत्थंभूतलक्षणे इति ।

For he gives prominence to *lakṣana* by reading it as the second member of *itthambhūtalakṣaṇē*, the seventh case of the *tatpuruṣa-itthambhūtalakṣaṇam*.

संज्ञोऽन्यतरस्यां कर्मणि (2, 3, 22)

संज्ञः कृत्प्रयोगे षष्ठी विप्रतिषेधेन

There is need to enjoin *ṣaṣṭhī* with the root *jñā* preceded by the preposition *sam* and followed by *kṛt* suffix through *vipratiṣēdha*.

संज्ञोऽन्यतरस्यां कर्मणि इत्येतस्मात् कृद्योगे षष्ठी भवति विप्रतिषेधेन । संज्ञोऽन्यतरस्यामित्यस्य अवकाशः - मातरं संजानीते, मात्रा संजानीते; कृत्प्रयोगे षष्ठ्या अवकाशः - इध्मप्रव्रश्चनः, पलाशशातनः । इहोभयं प्राप्नोति - मातुः संज्ञाता, पितुः संज्ञाता इति । षष्ठी भवति विप्रतिषेधेन ।

Kṛdyōgē ṣaṣṭhī bhavati vipratiṣēdhēna has to be read supplementing the *sūtra Saṁjñōsnyatarasyām karmaṇi.* The place where the *sūtra Saṁjñōsnyatarasyām* operates is: *mātaram sañjānītē* and *mātrā sañjānītē.* The place where *ṣaṣṭhī* appears with *kṛtprayōga* is *Idhmapravraścanaḥ* and *palāśaśātanaḥ.* Both may operate here and *ṣaṣṭhī* appears through *vipratiṣēdha* :—*Mātuḥ saṁjñātā* and *pituḥ saṁjñātā.*

उपपदविभक्तेश्चोपपदक्तिः

Need for the supplement that the *upapadavibhakti* which is enjoined later overrules that enjoined earlier through *vipratiṣēdha.*

उपपदविभक्तेश्चोपपदविभक्तिर्भवति विप्रतिषेधेन

One *upapadavibhakti* overrules another through *vipratiṣēdha.*

अन्यारादितरर्तेदिक्छब्दाञ्चूत्तरपदाजाहियुक्ते इत्यस्य अवकाशः अन्यो देवदत्तात् । स्वामीश्वराधिपतिदायादसाक्षिप्रतिभूप्रसूतैश्च इत्यस्य अवकाशः गोषु स्वामी गवां स्वामी । इहोभयं प्राप्नोति - अन्यो गोषु स्वामी, अन्यो गवां स्वामी इति । स्वामीश्वराधिपतिदायादसाक्षिप्रतिभूप्रसूतैश्च इत्येतद् भवति विप्रतिषेधेन ।

The room for the *sūtra Anya-ārād*....(2, 3, 29) to operate is *Anyō Dēvadattāt.* The room for the *sūtra Svāmīśvara*...(2, 3, 39) is *Gōṣu svāmī* and *gavām svāmī.* Both may operate here and the latter *Svāmī*...operates through *vipratiṣēdha—Anyō gōṣu svāmī* and *anyō gavām svāmī.*

नैष युक्तो विप्रतिषेधः । न ह्यत्र गावोऽन्ययुक्ताः

Vipratiṣēdha here is not legitimate; for cows are not here related to *anya.*

कस्तर्हि ? What then ?

स्वामी *Svāmī*

एवं तर्हि, तुल्यार्थैरतुलोपमाभ्यां तृतीयान्यतरस्याम् इत्यस्य अवकाशः तुल्यो देवदत्तस्य, तुल्यो देवदत्तेन इति । स्वामीश्वराधिपतिदायादसाक्षिप्रतिभूप्रसूतैश्च इत्यस्य अवकाशः स एव । इहोभयं प्राप्नोति - तुल्यो गोभिः स्वामी, तुल्यो गवां स्वामी इति । तुल्यार्थैरतुलोपमाभ्यां तृतीयान्यतरस्याम् इत्येतद् भवति विप्रतिषेधेन ।

If so, room for *sūtra Tulyārthāir....*(2, 3, 72) to operate is *Tulyō Dēvadattasya* and *tulyō Dēvadattēna.* Room for *Svāmīśvara....* (2, 3, 39) is the same mentioned above. Here both have room to operate and *Tulyārthāir....*overrules the other through *vipratiṣēdha* and hence the forms *Tulyō gōbhiḥ svāmī* and *tulyō gavām svāmī* are secured.

हेतौ (2, 3, 23)

निमित्तकारणहेतुषु सर्वासां प्रायदर्शनम्

Appearance of almost all case-suffixes with *nimitta, kāraṇa* and *hētu.*

निमित्तकारणहेतुषु सर्वाः प्रायेण दृश्यन्त इति वक्तव्यम् । किं निमित्तं वसति, केन निमित्तेन वसति, कस्मै निमित्ताय वसति, कस्मान्निमित्ताद्वसति, कस्य निमित्तस्य वसति, कस्मिन्निमित्ते वसति । किं कारणं वसति, केन कारणेन वसति, कस्मै कारणाय वसति, कस्मात् कारणाद्वसति, कस्य कारणस्य वसति, कस्मिन् कारणे वसति । को हेतुर्वसति, कं हेतुं वसति, केन हेतुना वसति, कस्मै हेतवे वसति, कस्माद्धेतोर्वसति, कस्य हेतोर्वसति, कस्मिन् हेतौ वसति ॥[1]

It must be stated that almost all case-suffixes are used after the words *nimitta, kāraṇa* and *hētu.* Viz. *Kiṁ nimittam vasati, kēna nimittēna vasati, kasmāi nimittāya vasati, kasmād nimittād vasati, kasya nimittasya vasati, kasmin nimittē vasati. Kiṁ kāraṇam vasati, kēna kāraṇēna vasati, kasmāi kāraṇāya vasati, kasmāt kāraṇād vasati, kasya kāraṇasya vasati, kasmin kāraṇē vasati. Kō hētur vasati, kam hētum vasati, kēna hētunā vasati, kasmāi hētavē vasati, kasmād hētōr vasati, kasya hētōr vasati, kasmin hētāu vasati.*

1. Since the stem means cause, it seems immaterial which case-suffix is used after it.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that the enumeration of synonyms is, according to some, to ward off others and according to others, to show that that they are *upalakṣaṇa*.

अपादाने पञ्चमी (2, 3, 28)

पञ्चमीविधाने ल्यब्लोपे कर्मण्युपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to supplement *Lyab-lōpē karmaṇi* under *pañcamyadhikāra*

पञ्चमीविधाने ल्यब्लोपे कर्मणि पञ्चम्या उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - प्रासादमारुह्य प्रेक्षते - प्रासादात्प्रेक्षते

There is need to supplement *lyab-lōpē pañcamī*, so that *pañcamī* may be used after the *karman* of the indeclinable participle which is dropped *Prāsādāt prēkṣatē* for *prāsādam āruhya prēkṣatē*.

अधिकरणे च Need to supplement *Adhikaraṇē ca*

अधिकरणे चोपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - आसनात्प्रेक्षते, शयनात्प्रेक्षते

There is need to add that *pañcamī* is used in place of *adhikaraṇa* to secure the forms *āsanāt prēkṣatē* and *śayanāt prēkṣatē* (in case there is *lyab-lōpa*).

प्रश्नाख्यानयोश्च

Need to allow the use of *pañcamī* in question and answer also.

प्रश्नाख्यानयोश्च पञ्चमी वक्तव्या - कुतो भवान्? पाटलिपुत्रात्

There is need to enjoin *pañcamī* in question and answer also. Viz. *Kutō bhavān*? *Pāṭaliputtrāt.*

यतश्चाध्वकालनिर्माणम्

Pañcamī after that from which distance and time are calculated.

यतश्चाध्वकालनिर्माणं तत्र पञ्चमी वक्तव्या - गवीधुमतः साङ्काश्यं चत्वारि योजनानि ; कार्तिक्या आग्रहायणी मासे

Pañcamī has to be enjoined after that whence distance and time are calculated. Viz. *Gavīdhumataḥ Sāṅkśyam catvāri yōjanāni* (*Sānkāśya* is four *yōjanas* from *Gavīdhuman*; *kārttikyā āgrahāyaṇī māsē*. (One month passing from *kārttika* it is *āgrahāyaṇī*).

तद्युक्तात्काले सप्तमी
Saptamī with reference to the *kāla* associated with it.

तद्युक्तात्काले सप्तमी वक्तव्या - कार्तिक्या आग्रहायणी मासे
Saptamī is to be enjoined to the *kāla* associated with it Viz. *Kārttikyā āgrahāyaṇī māsē.*

अध्वनः प्रथमा च The distance to be in the first case too.

अध्वनः प्रथमा च सप्तमी च वक्तव्या - गवीधुमतः साङ्काश्यं चत्वारि योजनानि, गवीधुमतः साङ्काश्यं चतुर्षु योजनेषु
There is need to enjoin *prathamā* and *saptamī* after *adhvan* viz. *Gavīdhumataḥ Sāṅkāśyam catvāri yōjanāni, Gavīdhumataḥ Sāṅkāśyam caturṣu yōjanēṣu,*

तत्तर्हीदं बहु वक्तव्यम् If so, much has to be enjoined here.

न वक्तव्यम् । अपादाने इत्येव सिद्धम्
No, it need not; everything is secured from *Apādānē pañcamī.*

इह तावत् प्रासादात् प्रेक्षते, शयनात्प्रेक्षते इति, अपक्रामति तत्तस्माद्दर्शनम्
Firstly with reference to *Prāsādāt prēkṣatē* and *śayanāt prēkṣatē*, the sense of sight departs from it.

यद्यपक्रामति किं नात्यन्तायापक्रामति ?
If it departs, does it not completely depart ?

सन्ततत्वात् It departs, in succession.

अथ वा अन्यान्यप्रादुर्भावात् - अन्या चान्या च प्रादुर्भवति
Or it departs one after another. The sight that departs at first is different from that which departs next and so on.

प्रश्नाख्यानयोश्च पञ्चमी वक्तव्येति, इदमत्र प्रयोक्तव्यं सन्न प्रयुज्यते - कुतो भवानागच्छति इति, पाटलिपुत्रादागच्छामि इति
With reference to *Praśnākhyānayōś ca pañcamī vaktavyā*, the word *āgacchati* or *āgacchāmi* is found dropped in *kutō bhavān āgacchati?* and *Pāṭaliputtrād āgacchāmi.*

यतश्चाध्वकालनिर्माणं तत्र पञ्चमी वक्तव्येति, इदमत्र प्रयोक्तव्यं सन्न प्रयुज्यते - गवीधुमतो निःसृत्य साङ्काश्यं चत्वारि योजनानि । कार्तिक्या आग्रहायणी मासे इति - इदमत्र प्रयोक्तव्यं सन्न प्रयुज्यते - कार्तिक्याः प्रभृति आग्रहायणी मासे इति

With reference to the statement that *pañcamī* should be used after that whence distance and time are calculated, the word *niḥsṛtya* to be used after the first word is dropped:-in *Gavīdhumatō Sāṅkāśyam catvāri yōjanāni* and the word *prabhṛti* is dropped in *kārttikyā agrahāyaṇī māsē*.

तद्युक्तात् काले सप्तमी वक्तव्येति, इदमत्र प्रयोक्तव्यं सन्न प्रयुज्यते कार्तिक्या प्रभृति आग्रहायणी गते मास इति

With reference to *Tadyuktāt kālē saptamī vaktavyā*, the word *gatē* to be used before *māsē* is left out in *kārttikyā āgrahāyaṇī māsē*.

अध्वनः प्रथमा च सप्तमी च इति - इदमत्र प्रयोक्तव्यं सन्न प्रयुज्यते - गवीधुमतो निःसृत्य यदा चत्वारि योजनानि गतानि भवन्ति, ततः साङ्काश्यं - चतुर्षु योजनेषु गतेषु ततः साङ्काश्यम् इति. ।

With reference to *Adhvanaḥ prathamā ca saptamī ca*, the sentences are read with ellipsis in place of *Gavīdhumatō niḥsṛtya yadā catvāri yōjanāni gatāni bhavanti, tataḥ Sāṅkāśyam*; and *Caturṣu yōjanēṣu gatēṣu tataḥ Sāṅkāśyam*.

NOTE:—*Mahābhāṣyakāra* argues that the purpose of the supplementary *vārttikas* is served by the *sūtra* itself.

अन्यारादितरर्तेदिक्शब्दाञ्चूत्तरपदाजाहियुक्ते (2, 3, 29)

अञ्चूत्तरपदग्रहणं किमर्थं? न दिक्शब्दैर्योग इत्येव सिद्धम्?

What for is *añcūttarapada* read? Is not its purpose served by *Dikśabdāir yōgē*?

षष्ठ्यतसर्थप्रत्ययेनेति वक्ष्यति, तस्यायं पुरस्तादपकर्षः

He is going to read the *sūtra Ṣaṣṭhyatasarthapratyayēna* and this is its *apavāda* in advance.

षष्ठ्यतसर्थप्रत्ययेन (2, 3, 30)

अर्थग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is *artha* read?

षष्ठ्यतस्प्रत्ययेन इत्युच्यमाने इहैव स्यात् - दक्षिणतो ग्रामस्य, उत्तरतो ग्रामस्य इति; - इह न स्यात् - उपरि ग्रामस्य, उपरिष्टाद् ग्रामस्य इति । अर्थग्रहणे पुनः क्रियमाणे अतस्प्रत्ययेन च सिद्धं भवति यश्चान्यस्तेन समानार्थः

If the *sūtra* is read *Ṣaṣṭhyataspratyayēna*, it will operate only here—*Dakṣiṇatō grāmasya* and *uttaratō grāmasya* and not here—*Upari grāmasya* and *upariṣṭād grāmasya*. If, on the other hand, the word *artha* is read, it will operate with reference to the words ending in *atas-pratyaya* and also words having the same meaning.

अथ प्रत्ययग्रहणं किमर्थम् ? Why is *pratyaya* read?

इह मा भूत् - प्राग् ग्रामात्, प्रत्यग् ग्रामात्

So that the *sūtra* may not operate here in *Prāg grāmāt* and *pratyag grāmāt*.

अञ्चूत्तरपदस्याप्येतत्प्रयोजनमुक्तम् । तत्र अन्यतरत् शक्यमवक्तुम् ।

The same benefit is said with reference to *Añcūttarapada* in the previous *sūtra* also. Hence either of the two may be dropped.

पृथग्विनानानाभिस्तृतीयान्यतरस्याम् (2, 3, 32)

पृथगादिषु पञ्चमीविधानम्

Need to enjoin *pañcamī* with reference to *pṛthagādis*.

पृथगादिषु पञ्चमी विधेया - पृथग् देवदत्तात्

There is need to enjoin *pañcamī* after *pṛthagādis* to secure *Pṛthag Dēvadattāt*.

किमर्थम् ? न प्रकृतं पञ्चमीग्रहणमनुवर्तते !

What for? Is there no *anuvṛtti* for *pañcamī* from the context?

क्व प्रकृतम् ? What is the *sūtra* referred to?

अपादाने पञ्चमी इति The *sūtra Apādānē pañcamī*.

अनधिकारात् On account of the absence of *adhikāra*.

अनधिकारः सः It is not endowed with the sign of *adhikāra*.

अधिकारे हि द्वितीयाषष्ठीविषये प्रतिषेधः

If there is *adhikāra*, it should be prohibited in *Enapā dvitīyā* and *Ṣaṣṭhyatasarthapratyayēna* enjoining *dvitīyā* and *ṣaṣṭhī*.

अधिकारे हि द्वितीयाषष्ठीविषये प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः स्यात् - दक्षिणेन ग्रामं, दक्षिणतो ग्रामस्य ।

For, if there is *adhikāra*, it should be prohibited in the preceding *sūtras* enjoining *dvitīyā* and *ṣaṣṭhī*, to secure only the following expressions—*Dakṣiṇēna grāmam* and *dakṣiṇatō grāmasya.*

एवं तर्हि अन्यतरस्यांग्रहणसामर्थ्यात्पञ्चमी भविष्यति ।

If so, *pañcamī* is secured here on the strength of the word *anyatarasyām* read here.

अस्त्यन्यद् अन्यतरस्यांग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनम्

Another purpose is served by *anyatarasyām.*

किम्? What?

यस्यां नाप्राप्तायां तृतीया आरभ्यते सा यथा स्यात्

To allow such case-suffix to appear whose chance disappears on account of the reading of *tṛtīyā.*

कस्यां च नाप्राप्तायाम्? In whose chance?

अन्ततः षष्ठ्याम् In the place of *ṣaṣṭhī* enjoined at the end.

तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must then be read.

न वक्तव्यम् । प्रकृतमनुवर्तते

No, it need not be read. There is *anuvṛtti* for the *prakṛta.*

क्व प्रकृतम्? What is it which is *prakṛta.*

अपादाने पञ्चमी इति The *sūtra Apādānē pañcamī.*

ननु चोक्तम् - अनधिकारः सः, अधिकारे हि द्वितीयाषष्ठीविषये प्रतिषेध इति

Oh, it was said that it is not endowed with *adhikāratva* and if it is so, there is need for the *pratiṣēdha* to *pañcamī* in the *sūtras* enjoining *dvitīyā* and *ṣaṣṭhī.*

एवं तर्हि सम्बन्धमनुवर्तिष्यते - अपादाने पञ्चमी - अन्यारादितरर्तेदिक्शब्दाञ्चूत्तरपदाजाहियुक्ते पञ्चमी - षष्ठ्यतसर्थप्रत्ययेन, अन्यारादिभिर्योगेपञ्चमी - एनपा द्वितीया, अन्यारादिभिर्योगे पञ्चमी - पृथग्विनानानाभिस्तृतीयान्यतरस्याम् - पञ्चमीग्रहणमनुवर्तते; अन्यारादिभिर्योगे इति निवृत्तम् ।

If so *anuvṛtti* for that connected with *anya* etc. is resorted to:— *Apādānē pañcamī, Anyārāditartēdikśabdāncūttarpadājāhiyuktē pañcamī, Ṣaṣṭhyatasarthapratyayēna, anyārādibhiryōgē pañcamī,*

Enapā dvitīyā, *anyārādibhiryōgē pañcamī* and then *Pṛthagvinā-nānābhis tṛtīyānyatarasyām* is read. The expression *pañcamī* is supplied and the expression *Anyārādibhiryōgē* is made to recede.

अथवा मण्डूकप्लुतयोऽधिकाराः । तद्यथा – मण्डूका उत्प्लुत्योत्प्लुत्य गच्छन्ति तद्वदधिकाराः ।

Or *anuvṛttis* are like frog-leap. As frogs skip over intermediate things, so are *adhikāras*.

अथ वा Or

अन्यवचनाच्चकाराकरणात्प्रकृतस्यापवादो विज्ञायते यथोत्सर्गेण प्रसक्तस्य

Or on account of the reading of another *vibhakti* and the absence of *ca*, it is understood to be an exception as a special rule prevents the application of a general rule.

अन्यस्या विभक्तेर्वचनात् चकारस्य अनुकर्षणार्थस्य अकरणात् प्रकृतायाः पञ्चम्याः द्वितीयाषष्ठ्यौ बाधिके भविष्यतः, यथोत्सर्गेण प्रसक्तस्यापवादो बाधको भविष्यति ।

Since another *vibhakti* is enjoined and since the word *ca* which denotes grammatical attraction is not read, *dvitīyā* and *ṣaṣṭhī* set aside the *pañcamī* enjoined first, in the same way as a special rule sets aside what will, otherwise, happen by the general rule.

अथ वा वक्ष्यत्येतत् अनुवर्तन्ते च नाम विधयः, न चानुवर्तनादेव भवन्ति

Or he is going to say this-that, though rules have the capacity to be supplied later on, they do not do so only on account of it.

किं तर्हि ? By what then ?

यत्नाद् भवन्ति इति By the effort.

दूरान्तिकार्थेभ्यो द्वितीया च (2, 3, 35)

दूरान्तिकार्थेभ्यः पञ्चमीविधाने तद्युक्तात् पञ्चमीप्रतिषेधः

Need to prohibit *pañcamī* after the word associated with *dūra*, *antika* and their synonyms when *pañcamī* is enjoined after them.

दूरान्तिकार्थेभ्यः पञ्चमीविधाने तद्युक्तात् पञ्चम्याः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - दूराद् ग्रामस्य

There is need to prohibit *pañcamī* after the word associated with *dūra*, *antika* and their synonyms, when *pañcamī* is enjoined after them, to secure the expression *Dūrād grāmasya*.

न वा तत्रापि दर्शनादप्रतिषेधः

No, it need not be prohibited, since it too is current.

अनर्थकः प्रतिषेधः अप्रतिषेधः । न वा तत्रापि दर्शनात् पञ्चम्याः प्रतिषेधोऽनर्थकः । तत्रापि हि पञ्चमी दृश्यते—

दूरादावसथान्मूत्रं दूरात्पादावसेचनम् ।
दूराच्च भाव्यं दस्युभ्यो दूराच्च कुपिताद्गुरोः ॥

Apratiṣēdhaḥ means the *pratiṣēdha* which is unnecessary. The prohibition is not necessary since *pañcamī* is current there too. *Pañcamī* is seen in such places in the following verse:—

Dūrād āvasathān mūtram dūrāt pādāvasēcanam ।
Dūrācca bhāvyam dasyubhyō dūrācca kupitād gurōḥ ॥

NOTE:—The fifth case-suffix in *āvasathāt*, *dasyubhyaḥ* and *kupitād* is the point referred to above.

सप्तम्यधिकरणे च (2, 3, 36)

सप्तमीविधाने क्तस्येन्विषयस्य कर्मण्युपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to read the supplement *ktasya inviṣayasya karmaṇi* in *saptamyadhikāra*.

सप्तमीविधाने क्तस्येन्विषयस्य कर्मण्युपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - अधीती व्याकरणे, परिगणिती याज्ञिक्ये, आम्नाती छन्दसि ।

It is necessary to supplement that *saptamī* follows the *karma* of the verbal noun ending in *kta* followed by *in*. Viz. *Adhītī Vyākaraṇē* (student in grammar). *Parigaṇitī yājñikyē* (Renowned in priesthood in sacrifices), *Āmnātī chandasi* (specialist in the study of the *Vēdas*).

साध्वसाधुप्रयोगे च

After the words qualifying *sādhu* and *asādhu*.

साध्वसाधुप्रयोगे च सप्तमी वक्तव्या – साधुर्देवदत्तो मातरि, असाधुः पितरि

There is need to enjoin *saptamī* after words qualifying *sādhu* and *asādhu*. Viz. *Sādhur Dēvadattō mātari* and *asādhuḥ pitari*.

कारकार्हाणां च कारकत्वे

Also when those that deserve to do action do it.

कारकार्हाणां च कारकत्वे सप्तमी वक्तव्या – ऋद्धेषु भुञ्जानेषु दरिद्रा आसते, ब्राह्मणेषु तरत्सु वृषला आसते ।

Saptamī is to be enjoined also when those that deserve to do action do it. Viz. *Ṛddhēṣu bhuñjānēṣu daridrā āsatē* (when men in prosperity enjoy, the poor keep quiet); *brāhmaṇēṣu taratsu vṛṣalā āsatē* (when brahmans cross, *vṛṣalas* keep quiet).

अकारकार्हाणां चाकारकत्वे

Also when those that do not deserve to do an action do not do it.

अकारकार्हाणां चाकारकत्वे सप्तमी वक्तव्या - मूर्खेष्वासीनेषु ऋद्धा भुञ्जते, वृषलेष्वासीनेषु ब्राह्मणास्तरन्ति

Also when those that do not deserve to do an action do not do it. Viz. *Mūrkhēṣu āsīnēṣu ṛddhā bhuñjatē, Vṛṣalēṣu āsīnēṣu brāhmaṇās taranti.*

तद्विपर्यासे च Also when the same is topsyturvy.

तद्विपर्यासे च सप्तमी वक्तव्या – ऋद्धेष्वासीनेषु मूर्खा भुञ्जते, ब्राह्मणेष्वासीनेषु वृषलास्तरन्ति

Saptamī is to be enjoined even when the same is topsyturvy. Viz. *Ṛddhēṣu āsīnēṣu mūrkhā bhuñjatē, brāhmaṇēṣu āsīnēṣu vṛṣalās taranti.*

निमित्तात्कर्मसंयोगे च

Also after the word denoting the fruit of the action when it is in association with the *karma* of the action.

निमित्तात् कर्मसंयोगे सप्तमी वक्तव्या

चर्मणि द्वीपिनं हन्ति दन्तयोर्हन्ति कुञ्जरम् ।
केशेषु चमरीं हन्ति सीम्नि पुष्कलको हतः ॥

Saptamī is to be enjoined to the word denoting *kriyāphala* when it is in association with the *karma* of the *kriyā*.

Carmaṇi dvīpinam hanti. (He kills the leopord for the skin)
Dantayōr hanti kuñjaram. (He kills the elephant for tusks)
Kēśēṣu camarīm hanti. - (He kills *camarī* for the hair)
Sīmni puṣkalakō hataḥ. (Musk-deer is killed for the scrotum)

यस्य च भावेन भावलक्षणम् (2, 3, 37)

भावलक्षणे सप्तमीविधानेऽभावलक्षणे उपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to add that the seventh case-suffix follows *kriyāvācaka* when the *kriyā* is not the *nimitta* of another *kriyā*.

भावलक्षणे सप्तमीविधानेऽभावलक्षण उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - अग्निषु हूयमानेषु प्रस्थितः, हुतेषु आगतः ; गोषु दृश्यमानासु प्रस्थितः, दुग्धास्वागतः ।

When *saptamī* is enjoined to *bhāva* which serves as *lakṣaṇa*, there is need to enjoin the same even when it does not serve as *lakṣaṇa*. Viz. *Agniṣu hūyamānēṣu prasthitaḥ*, *hutēṣu āgataḥ* (He started when *agnihōtra* was started and returned when it ended) ; *Gōṣu duhyamānāsu prasthitaḥ, dugdhāsvāgataḥ.* (He started when the cows were being milked and returned when the milking was over).

किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति ?

How is it not accomplished from the *sūtra* itself ?

लक्षणं नाम तद् भवति येन पुनः पुनर्लक्ष्यते । सकृच्चासौ कथं चिदग्निषु हूयमानेषु प्रस्थितः, हुतेष्वागतः; गोषु दुह्यमानासु प्रस्थितः, दुग्धास्वागतः ॥

Lakṣaṇa is that which is frequently seen in concomitance with *lakṣya*. This is seen only once by chance that he started when *agnihōtra* commenced and returned when it ended or that he started when the cows were being milked and returned when the milking was over.

सिद्धं तु भावप्रवृत्तौ यस्य भावारम्भवचनात्

The object is achieved by reading the *sūtra Yasya ca bhāvapravṛttāu bhāvārambhaḥ.*

सिद्धमेतत् The object is achieved.

कथम् ? How ?

यस्य भावप्रवृत्तौ द्वितीयो भाव आरभ्यते तत्र सप्तमी वक्तव्या
Saptamī is to be enjoined to the word which denotes an action, when another action takes place at the same time.

सिध्यति । सूत्रं तर्हि भिद्यते
Yes, the object is accomplished. But the *sūtra* is to be recast.

यथान्यासमेवास्तु Let the *sūtra* remain as it is.

ननु चोक्तं भावलक्षणे सप्तमीविधानेऽभावलक्षण उपसङ्ख्यानम् इति
Oh, it was said *Bhāvalakṣaṇē saptamīvidhānē abhāvalakṣaṇa upasaṅkhyānam*.

नैष दोषः । न खल्वश्यं तदेव लक्षणं भवति येन पुनः पुनर्लक्ष्यते । सकृदपि यन्निमित्तत्वाय कल्पते तदपि लक्षणं भवति । तद्यथा - अपि भवान् कमण्डलुपाणिं छात्रमद्राक्षीदिति ? सकृदसौ कमण्डलुपाणिः दृष्टः छात्रः, तस्य तदेव लक्षणं भवति ।
This difficulty does not arise. It is not absolutely necessary that it alone deserves to be *lakṣaṇa* which is frequently seen in concomitance with *lakṣya*. Even when two things are seen together for a moment, one becomes the *lakṣaṇa* of another. For instance, one puts this question, "Did you see the pupil having *kamaṇḍalu* in his hand?" The pupil was seen only once with *kamaṇḍalu* in his hand. The same becomes his *lakṣaṇa*.

पञ्चमी विभक्ते (2, 3, 42)

इह कस्मान्न भवति - कृष्णा गवां संपन्नक्षीरतमा इति ?

Why does not *pañcamī* appear here in *gavām* of *Kṛṣṇā gavām sampannakṣīratamā* (Black cow among cows gives a large quantity of milk) ?

विभक्त इत्युच्यते, न चैतद् विभक्तम्
The word *vibhakta* is read and this is not *vibhakta* (different element).

विभक्तमेतत् - गोभ्यः कृष्णा विभज्यते

This too is *vibhakta.* The black cow is different from cows.

विभक्तमेव यन्नित्यं तत्र भवितव्यम्, न चैतन्नित्यं विभक्तम्

It should appear where *vibhaktatva* is *nitya* and the *vibhaktatva* here is not *nitya*.

NOTE :—*Vibhakta* refers to those which belong to different genera and not to those which have different individuality but belong to the same genus.

किं वक्तव्यमेतत्? Is this to be stated?

न हि No, It need not.

कथमनुच्यमानं गंस्यते

How is it to be understood without its being stated?

विभक्तग्रहणसामर्थ्यात्

On the *sāmarthya* of the word *vibhakta* which is read.

यदि यद् विभक्तं चाविभक्तं च तत्र स्याद् विभक्तग्रहणम् अनर्थकं स्यात्

If it applies with reference to those which are *vibhakta* (with reference to individuality) and *avibhakta* (with reference to genus), the reading of the word *vibhakta* in the *sūtra* is unnecessary.

साधुनिपुणाभ्यामर्चायां सप्तम्यप्रतेः (2, 3, 43)

अप्रत्यादिभिः *Apratēḥ* is to be replaced by *apratyādibhiḥ*.

अप्रत्यादिभिरिति वक्तव्यम् - इहापि यथा स्यात् - साधुर्देवदत्तो मातरं परि, मातरमनु ।

Apratyādibhiḥ is to be read in place of *apratēḥ*, so that the seventh case may not follow *mātṛ* in the following expressions: *Sādhur Dēvadattō mātaram pari, mātaram anu.*

प्रसितोत्सुकाभ्यां तृतीया च (2, 3, 44)

प्रसित इत्युच्यते, कः प्रसितो नाम?

The word *prasita* is read. What is that word *prasita*?

यस्तत्र नित्यं प्रतिबद्धः

It means one who is *pratibaddha* intermittently.

कुत एतत्? How is it so interpreted?

सिनोतिरयं बध्नात्यर्थे वर्तते, बद्ध इवासौ तत्र भवति

The root *si* (5th conjugation) means to bind; he remains as if he is bound.

नक्षत्रे च लुपि (2, 3, 45)

इह कस्मान्न भवति - अद्य पुष्यः अद्य मघा

Why does not the *sūtra* operate here in *Adya puṣyaḥ* and *adya maghā*?

अधिकरण इति वर्तते There is *anuvṛtti* to the word *adhikaraṇe*.

Āhnika – Twentyfive ends.

(Second *adhyāya*, third *pāda*, second *āhnika* ends.

Āhnika — Twentysix

(Second *adhyāya*, third *pāda*, third *āhnika*)

प्रातिपदिकार्थलिङ्गपरिमाणवचनमात्रे प्रथमा (2, 3, 46)

There are *eight* topics dealt with here:—(1–5) Benefits of reading *prātipadika*, *liṅga*, *parimāṇa*, *vacana* and *mātra* in the *sūtra*: (6) Need or otherwise of the *upasaṅkhyāna* of *Pada-sāmānādhikaraṇyē* (7-8). Replacing the *sūtra* by *Abhihitē prathamā* or *Tiṅsamānādhikaraṇē prathamā*.

I

प्रातिपदिकग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is *prātipadika* read ?

उच्चैः, नीचैः इत्यत्रापि यथा स्यात्

To allow *prathamā* in the *avyayas-uccāiḥ* and *nīcāiḥ* also.

किं पुनरत्र प्रथमया प्रार्थ्यते ?

What is aimed at by admitting *prathamā* (which is elided) after them ?

पदत्वम् *Padatvam*

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *padatva* is secured by the dictum :–*Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam*.

नैतदस्ति । षष्ठ्या अत्र पदत्वं भविष्यति

It is not so. *Padatva* is secured here through *ṣaṣṭhī* on the strength of the *sūtra Ṣaṣṭhī śēṣē*.

इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् - ग्राम उच्चैस्तव स्वम्, ग्राम उच्चैस्ते स्वम् - सपूर्वायाः प्रथमाया विभाषा इत्येष विधिर्यथा स्यात्

This, then, is the benefit that the *sūtra Sapūrvāyāḥ prathamāyā vibhāṣā* (8, 1, 26) may operate to secure *tē* in *Grāma uccāis tē svam* along with *tava* in *Grāma uccāis tava svam*.

II

अथ लिङ्गग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is *liṅga* read ?

स्त्री, पुमान्, नपुंसकम् इत्यत्रापि यथा स्यात्

To allow *prathamā* after the words *strī*, *pumān* and *napuṁsakam* also.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम्, एष एवात्र प्रातिपदिकार्थः

No, it cannot be the benefit, since the same is the meaning of the stem there.

इदं तर्हि, कुमारी, वृक्षः, कुण्डम् इति

If so, the use of *prathamā* after the words *kumārī, vṛkṣaḥ* and *kuṇḍam* is the benefit.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* prefers *taṭaḥ* and *taṭam* as *udāharaṇa.*

III

अथ परिमाणग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is *parimāṇa* read ?

द्रोणः, खारी, आढकम् इत्यत्रापि यथा स्यात्

To allow *prathamā* after the words *drōṇa, khārī* and *āḍhakam* also.

NOTE :—1. The words *drōṇa* etc. denote measure. If they are used in the sense of objects that serve as measure, *parimāṇa* is the meaning of the *prātipadika* and hence the word *parimāṇa* is not needed in the *sūtra*. But if, on the other hand, they denote grain of that measure (*parimēya*) by *lakṣaṇā*, it does not become the *prātipadikārtha* and hence it is to be read in the *sūtra*.

NOTE :—2. *Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* explains the *bhāṣya* thus:-So that there may be *anvaya* of *parimāṇa* which is *vibhaktyartha*, with *vrīhi*, the *parimēya*, through measured measuring - relationship. He further states that the meaning of the stem in *drōṇa* is *drōṇatva* and not *parimāṇatva* and the reading of *parimāṇa* in the *sūtra* is for *vāilakṣaṇya* in *śābdabōdha*.

IV

अथ वचनग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is *vacana* read ?

इह समुदाये वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिर्दृश्यते । तद्यथा - गर्गाः शतं दण्ड्यन्ताम् इति, अर्थिनश्च राजानो हिरण्येन भवन्ति, न च प्रत्येकं दण्डयन्ति । सत्येतस्मिन् दृष्टान्ते यत्रैतानि सर्वाणि समुदितानि भवन्ति तत्रैव स्यात् - द्रोणः खारी आढकम् इति । इह न स्यात् - कुमारी, वृक्षः, कुण्डम् इति ।

The fruit of the *vidhi* in this *sūtra* is seen collectively (so that, *prathamā* may appear where all the three - *prātipadikārtha*, *liṅga* and *vacana* - are present). This is seen from the following *nyāya* :- *Gargāḥ śatam daṇḍyantām* (Let *Gargas* be fined hundred coins). Kings want money and they do not fine them individually. Following this *nyāya*, *prathamā* will set in only where all the three are expressed, as in *drōṇaḥ*, *khārī* and *āḍhakam* and will not appear in *kumārī*, *vṛkṣaḥ* and *kuṇḍam*.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । प्रत्येकमपि वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिर्दृश्यते । तद्यथा गुण-वृद्धिसंज्ञे प्रत्येकं भवतः ।

This cannot be the benefit. The fruit of the meaning of the sentence is seen individually also, as with reference to the designations *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*.

इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् - उक्तेष्वप्येकत्वादिषु प्रथमा यथा स्यात् - एकः, द्वौ, बहवः इति

This, then, is the benefit that *prathamā* appears in the words *ēkaḥ*, *dvāu* and *bahavaḥ* even though *ēkatva* etc. have been expressed (by the stem).

NOTE :—*Vacana* refers to *saṅkhyā* according to *pūrvācāryas*.

V

अथ मात्रग्रहणं किमर्थम् ? Why is *mātra* read ?

एतन्मात्र एव प्रथमा यथा स्यात् कर्मादिविशिष्टे मा भूदिति - कटं करोति

To allow *prathamā* only when the meaning of the stem alone is expressed and not when *karmatva* etc too are expressed in addition, as in *kaṭam karōti*.

NOTE:—This arises in *pratyayaniyama-pakṣa* thus-*Karmaṇi dvitīyā* etc. are taken that *dvitīyā* etc. may express only *karmatva* etc. This will not prohibit *prathamā* from expressing them.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । कर्मादिषु द्वितीयाद्याः विभक्तयः । ताः कर्मादिविशिष्टे बाधिका भविष्यन्ति ।

No, this is not the benefit. The *vibhaktis-dvitīyā* etc. enjoined to denote *karmatva* etc. prevent *prathamā* being used there (i.e.) in *arthaniyama-pakṣa*.

अथ वा आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति न कर्मादिविशिष्टे प्रथमा भवतीति, यदयं सम्बोधने प्रथमां शास्ति ।

Or the procedure of *Ācārya* (*Sūtrakāra*) suggests that *prathamā* does not appear to denote *karmatva* etc. also, since he enjoins *prathamā* in the vocative case (and hence there is no harm in *pratyayaniyama-pakṣa*).

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that the statement that *prathamā* denotes vocative will be unnecessary, if it is taken to express *karmatva* etc.

नैतदस्ति ज्ञापकम् । अस्ति ह्यन्यदेतस्य वचने प्रयोजनम्

This does not serve as a *jñāpaka*; for another purpose is served by reading it.

किम्? What?

सामन्त्रितमिति वक्ष्यामि इति

I am going to give the *saṁjñā Sāmantritam* to that which ends in it.

यत्तर्हि योगविभागं करोति । इतरथा हि सम्बोधने आमन्त्रितम् इत्येव ब्रूयात् ।

It is not the case, since he reads them as two *sūtras*. Otherwise he would have read them as one *sūtra* thus: *Sambōdhanē āmantritam*.

इदं तर्हि उक्तेष्वपि एकत्वादिषु प्रथमा यथा स्यात् - एकः, द्वौ, बहवः इति

This, then, is the benefit that *prathamā* appears in *ēkaḥ, dvāu* and *bahavaḥ* even though *ēkatva* etc. are expressed by the *prātipadikas*.

वचनग्रहणस्यापि एतत् प्रयोजनमुक्तम् । अन्यतरत् शक्यमवक्तुम् ।

The same *prayōjana* was stated for reading *vacana* and hence either of the two - *vacana* and *mātra* – may be dropped.

VI

प्रातिपदिकार्थलिङ्गपरिमाणवचनमात्रे प्रथमालक्षणे पदसामानाधिकरण्ये उपसङ्ख्यानमधिकत्वात्

There is need for adding *padasāmānādhikaraṇyē* in the *prathamālakṣaṇasūtra-Prātipadikārtha-liṅga-parimāṇa-vacana-mātrē prathamā*, since it makes its appearance in addition.

प्रातिपदिकार्थलिङ्गपरिमाणवचनमात्रे प्रथमालक्षणे पदसामानाधिकरण्ये उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् – वीरः पुरुषः इति ।

There is need for the *upasaṅkhyāna* of *padasāmānādhikaraṇyē* in the *sūtra Prātipadikārtha-liṅga-parimāṇa-vacana-mātrē prathamā*, so that *prathamā* may follow *puruṣa* in *vīraḥ puruṣaḥ.*

किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति? Why will it not follow it?

अधिकत्वात् । व्यतिरिक्तः प्रातिपदिकार्थ इति कृत्वा प्रथमा न प्राप्नोति

On account of an extraneous element. *Prathamā* can not appear since the *prātipadikārtha* is something other *liṅga, parimāṇa* and *vacana* alone.

कथं व्यतिरिक्तः?

What is it which makes it other than *liṅga* etc.?

पुरुषे वीरत्वम्

Vīratva in the meaning of *puruṣa* is an extraneous element.

न वा वाक्यार्थत्वात्

No, it need not be read, on account of its *viśēṣaṇa-viśēṣyabhāva* being the meaning of *vākya*.

न वा वक्तव्यम् It need not be read.

किं कारणम्? Why?

वाक्यार्थत्वात् । यदत्राधिक्यं वाक्यार्थः सः

Since it comes under *vākyārtha*. The additional element is taken under *vākyārtha*.

VII

अथ वा 'अभिहिते प्रथमा" इत्येतल्लक्षणं करिष्यते

Or the *sūtra* is recast thus:—*Abhihitē prathamā.*

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* reads:—*Tiṅ-kṛt-taddhita-samāsāir abhihitē kartrādāu prathamā ityarthaḥ.*

अभिहितलक्षणायामनभिहिते प्रथमाविधिः

If *Abhihitē prathamā* is agreed to, there is need to enjoin *prathamā* where it is *anabhihita*.

अभिहितलक्षणायामनभिहिते प्रथमा विधेया - वृक्षः, प्लक्षः इति

There is need to enjoin *prathamā* where there is *anabhihitatva*, as in *vṛkṣaḥ*, *plakṣaḥ*, if the *lakṣaṇa Abhihitē prathamā* is accepted.

उक्तं वा It has been answered.

किमुक्तम्? How has it been answered?

अस्तिर्भवन्तीपरः प्रथमपुरुषोऽप्रयुज्यमानोऽप्यस्तीति गम्यते - वृक्षः प्लक्षः अस्तीति गम्यते इति

Asti in the present tense is taken to be understood after a noun of the third person though it is not read. Hence *asti* is taken to be understood after *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ*.

अभिहितानभिहिते हि प्रथमाभावः

There is chance for *prathamā* where there is *abhihitatva* and *anabhihitatva*.

अभिहितानभिहिते हि प्रथमा प्राप्नोति

There is chance for *prathamā* where there is *abhihitatva* and *anabhihitatva*.

क? Where?

प्रासादे आस्ते, शयने आस्ते इति । सदिप्रत्ययेन अभिहितमधिकरणमिति कृत्वा प्रथमा प्राप्नोति ।

There is chance for *prathamā* after *prāsāda* and *śayana* in the sentences *Prāsādē āstē* and *Śayanē āstē*, since *adhikaraṇatva* is expressed by the *kṛt-pratyaya a* after *sad* (and *śi*).

VIII

एवं तर्हि 'तिङ्समानाधिकरणे प्रथमा' इत्येतल्लक्षणं करिष्यते

If so, the *lakṣaṇa* is recast thus:—*Tiṅsamānādhikaraṇē prathamā*.

तिङ्समानाधिकरण इति चेत् तिङोऽप्रयोगे प्रथमाविधिः

If the *lakṣaṇa* is recast *Tiṅ-samānādhikaraṇē prathamā*, there is need to enjoin *prathamā* where *tiṅ* is not used.

तिङ्समानाधिकरण इति चेत् तिङोऽप्रयोगे प्रथमा विधेया वृक्षः, प्लक्षः
If the *lakṣaṇa* is recast *Tiṅ-samānādhikaraṇē prathamā*, there is need to enjoin *prathamā* where *tiṅ* is not used, as in *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ*.

उक्तं पूर्वेण It was answered previously.

किमुक्तम्? How was it answered?

अस्तिर्भवन्तीपरः प्रथमपुरुषोऽप्रयुज्यमानोऽप्यस्ति इति गम्यते - वृक्षः प्लक्षः, अस्तीति गम्यते इति
Asti in the present tense is taken to be understood after a noun of third person, if no verb is used after it. When *vṛkṣaḥ* or *plakṣaḥ* is used above, the word *asti* is taken to be understood.

शतृशानचोश्च निमित्तभावात्तिङोऽभावस्तयोरपवादत्वात्
No chance for *tiṅ* on account of *śatṛ* and *śānac* which are its *apavāda* having *nimitta* to appear.

शतृशानचोश्च निमित्तभावात्तिङोऽभावः
There is no chance for *tiṅ*, since there is *nimitta* for *śatṛ* and *śānac* to appear.

NOTE :—1. The *nimitta* for *śatṛ* and *śānac* is *aprathamā-sāmānādhikaraṇyam* mentioned in the *sūtra Laṭaḥ śatṛśānacā-vaprathamāsamānādhikaraṇē* (3, 2, 124).

NOTE :—2. *Kāiyaṭa* says that nominative suffix alone follows *Dēvadatta* only when the finished word *pacati* follows it. Before it there is chance for the second case-suffix to appear. In that case *śatṛ* and *śānac* alone will follow *pac* and not *tiṅ*.

क्व? Where?

पचत्योदनं देवदत्त इति
After the root *pac* in the sentence *Pacati ōdanam Dēvadattaḥ*.

किं कारणम्? Why?

तयोरपवादत्वात् । शतृशानचो तिङपवादौ । तौ अत्र बाधकौ । न च अपवादविषये उत्सर्गोऽभिनिविशते - पूर्वं ह्यपवादा अभिनिविशन्ते पश्चादुत्सर्गाः; प्रकल्प्य च अपवादविषयमुत्सर्गोऽभिनिविशते । न तावदत्र कदाचित् तिङादेशो भवति । अपवादौ तावत् शतृशानचौ प्रतीक्षते ।

On account of their being *apavāda*. *Śatṛ* and *śānāc* are *apavāda* of *tiṅ*. They may serve as *bādhaka* here. *Utsarga* does not step in the sphere of *apavāda*. For *apavādas* are given the first preference to act and then only *utsargas* operate; *utsargas* operate reserving room for *apavādas* to operate. In either case there is no chance for *tiṅ* to take the place of *lakāra*. It expects the *apavādas-śatṛ* and *śānac* to appear and recedes.

NOTE:—The former of the two principles stated above rests on *lakṣaṇāika-cakṣuṣka-darśanam* and the latter on *lakṣyāika-cakṣuṣka-darśanam*.

पाक्षिक एष दोषः

This difficulty will arise only when a particular doctrine is held.

कतरस्मिन्पक्षे शतृशानचोर्द्वैतं भवति - अप्रथमा वा विधिना आश्रीयते प्रथमा वा प्रतिषेधेन; विभक्तिनियमे चापि द्वैतं भवति, विभक्तिनियमो वा स्याद् अर्थनियमो वेति ?.

In what *pakṣa* does the difficulty arise? Is there conflict between *śatṛ* and *śānac* on one side and *tiṅ* on the other, when *aprathamā* is taken as *paryudāsa* or *prasajya pratiṣedha* and when *vibhakti-niyama* is taken in the *sūtras Karmaṇi dvitīyā* etc. or *arthaniyama* is taken ?

NOTE:—If *aprathamā* is taken as *paryudāsa*, the word *aprathamāsamānādhikaraṇe* means when there is *sāmānādhikaraṇya* with *dvitīyā*, *tṛtīyā* etc. and if it is taken as *prasajyapratiṣedha*, it means *śatṛ* and *śānac* do not replace *lakāra* when there is *sāmānādhikaraṇya* with *prathamā*. If *vibhaktiniyama* is taken in *Karmaṇi dvitīyā* etc, it means *karma* etc, are denoted by, *dvitīyā* etc. alone and *dvitīyā* etc. may have other meanings If *arthaniyama* is taken, *dvitīyā* etc. are used to denote *karma* etc. alone and *karma* etc. may be denoted by other cases also. *Nāgeśabhaṭṭa* says that *pratyayaniyama* alone is acceptable to *Sūtrakāra* and *arthaniyama* to *Vārttikakāra*.

तद्यदा तावद् अर्थनियमः, अप्रथमा च विधिना, आश्रीयते तदैष दोषो भवति । यदा हि विभक्तिनियमः, तदा यद्येवमप्रथमा विधिनाश्रीयते अथापि प्रथमा प्रतिषेधेन, तदा न दोषो भवति ॥

This difficulty arises only when *arthaniyamapakṣa* and *paryudāsapakṣa* of *aprathamā* are adhered to. With reference to *vibhaktiniyamapakṣa*, the difficulty does not at all arise whether *aprathamā* is *paryudāsa* or *prasajyapratiṣēdha*.

षष्ठी शेषे (2, 3, 50)

There are *four* topics here :—(1) The denotation of the word *śēṣa* (2) Its connotation (3) The need for *śēṣē* in the *sūtra* and (4) The need or otherwise of the *viśēṣyapratiṣēdha*.

I

शेष इत्युच्यते ; कः शेषो नाम ?

The word *śēṣē* is read. What does it denote?

कर्मादिभ्यो येऽन्येऽर्थाः स शेषः

Śēṣa denotes the meanings other than *karmādis*.

यद्येवं शेषो न प्रकल्पते । न हि कर्मादिभ्योऽन्येऽर्थाः सन्ति । इह तावत्, राज्ञः पुरुषः इति, राजा कर्ता, पुरुषः सम्प्रदानम् । वृक्षस्य शाखा इति, वृक्षः शाखाया अधिकरणम् । तथा यदेतत् स्वं नाम चतुर्भिरेतत्प्रकारैर्भवति - क्रयणाद् अपहरणाद्, याच्ञायाः, विनिमयाद् इति । अत्र च सर्वत्र कर्मादयः सन्ति ।

If so, nothing can be denoted by *śēṣa*; for nothing is beyond the range of *karmādis*. Firstly with reference to *rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ*, *rājā* is *kartā* and *puruṣa* is *sampradānam* [1]. With reference to *Vṛkṣasya śākhā*, *vṛkṣa* is the *adhikarana* of *śākhā*. With reference to ownership, it arises in four ways:—from purchase, from taking away, from requesting and from exchange. In all these cases one of *karmādis* does exist.

II

एवं तर्हि कर्मादीनामविवक्षा शेषः

If so, *śēṣa* connotes non-cognizance of *karmādis*.

1. This is so said since *puruṣa*, being under the service of the king, receives remuneration from him.

कथं पुनः सतो नामाविवक्षा स्यात्?

How cannot one take cognizance of what actually exists?

सतोऽप्यविवक्षा भवति - तद्यथा अलोमिका एडका, अनुदरा कन्या इति। असतश्च विवक्षा भवति - तद्यथा समुद्रः कुण्डिका, विन्ध्यो वर्धितकम् इति।

Sometimes even things that do exist are not taken cognizance of, as in—*Alōmikā ēḍakā* (eve without wool), and *Anudarā kanyā* (girl without abdomen). Sometimes even those that do not exist are expressed, as in *Samudraḥ kuṇḍikā* (the little pot is an ocean), and *Vindhyō vardhitakam* (the heap of food is *Vindhyas*).

III

किमर्थं पुनः शेषग्रहणम्? Why is *śēṣē* read?

प्रत्ययावधारणाच्छेषवचनम्

Need to read *śēṣē*, since *pratyayas* are *niyata*.

प्रत्ययावधारणात् शेषग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। प्रत्यया नियताः, अर्था अनियताः, तत्र षष्ठी प्राप्नोति। तत्र शेषग्रहणं कर्तव्यं षष्ठीनियमार्थं, शेष एव षष्ठी भवति, नान्यत्र इति।

There is need to read *śēṣē* on account of *pratyayas* being restricted. *Pratyayas* are *niyata* and *meanings* are *aniyata* and *ṣaṣṭhī* may appear there Hence there is need to read *śēṣē* to restrict that *ṣaṣṭhī* can be used only with reference to *śēṣa* and none else.

अर्थावधारणाद्वा Or on account of the *niyatatva* of meanings.

अथ वा अर्था नियताः, प्रत्यया अनियताः, ते शेषेऽपि प्राप्नुवन्ति। तत्र शेषग्रहणं कर्तव्यं शेषनियमार्थं - शेषे षष्ठ्येव भवति नान्या इति।

Or meanings are *niyata* and *pratyayas* are *aniyata* and they may chance to appear with reference to *śēṣa*. Hence is the need to read *śēṣē* for *śēṣaniyama*, that *ṣaṣṭhī* alone should be used with reference to *śēṣa*.

अर्थनियमे शेषग्रहणं शक्यमकर्तुम्

It is possible to manage without *śēṣē* in *arthaniyama-pakṣa*.

कथम्? How?

अर्था नियताः, प्रत्यया अनियताः । ततो वक्ष्यामि षष्ठी भवति इति । तन्नियमार्थं भविष्यति - यत्र षष्ठी चान्या च प्राप्नोति, षष्ठ्येव तत्र भवति इति ।
Meanings are restricted and *pratyayas* are unrestricted. I shall, then, read that *ṣaṣṭhī* makes its appearance. It serves the purpose of *niyama*, that *ṣaṣṭhī* alone appears, where both *ṣaṣṭhī* and *non-ṣaṣṭhī* have a chance to appear.

IV

षष्ठी शेष इति चेद् विशेष्यस्य प्रतिषेधः
If the *sūtra* is read *Ṣaṣṭhī śēṣē*, there is need to prohibit *viśēṣya* from taking it.

षष्ठी शेष इति चेद् विशेष्यस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । राज्ञः पुरुष इत्यत्र राजा विशेषणं, पुरुषो विशेष्यः । तत्र प्रातिपदिकार्थो व्यतिरिक्त इति कृत्वा प्रथमा न प्राप्नोति । तत्र षष्ठी स्यात्, तस्याः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः
If the *sūtra* is read *Ṣaṣṭhī śēṣē*, there is need to prohibit *viśēṣya* from taking *ṣaṣṭhī*. In the expression *Rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ*, *rājā* is *viśēṣaṇa* and *puruṣa* is *viśēṣya*. There is no chance for *prathamā* on the strength of the *sūtra Prātipadikārtha-liṅga* ... (2, 3, 46) after the word *puruṣa*, since its meaning has within it *rāja-nirūpita-viśēṣyatva* which is beyond the range of the *prātipadikārtha*. Hence is the chance for *ṣaṣṭhī* to appear there and it should be prohibited.

तत्र प्रथमाविधिः Need to enjoin *prathamā* there.

तत्र षष्ठीं प्रतिषिध्य प्रथमा विधेया, राज्ञः पुरुषः इति ।
There is need to enjoin *prathamā*, after prohibiting *ṣaṣṭhī* to secure the expression *Rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ*.

उक्तं पूर्वेण
It has already been answered (in the *bhāṣya* under 2, 3, 46)

किमुक्तम्? How has it been answered?

न वा वाक्यार्थत्वाद् इति । यदत्राधिक्यं वाक्यार्थः सः
It need not be read, on account of its being *vākyārtha*. The additional element which is mentioned here comes within the purview of the meaning of the sentence.

कुतो नु खल्वेतत् - पुरुषे यदाधिक्यं स वाक्यार्थ इति, न पुना राजनि यदाधिक्यं स वाक्यार्थः स्यात्

How is it that the additional element with reference to *puruṣa* comes within the the purview of *vākyārtha* and that the additional element with reference to *rājan* does not come under it?

अन्तरेणापि पुरुषशब्दस्य प्रयोगं राजनि सोऽर्थो गम्यते, न पुनरन्तरेण राजशब्दस्य प्रयोगं पुरुषे सोऽर्थो गम्यते ।

The additional element with reference to *rājan* comes within cognition even if *puruṣa* is not read; but, on the other hand, additional element with reference to *puruṣa* does not come within cognition except in its association with the word *rājñaḥ*.

अस्ति कारणं येनैतदेवं भवति

There is reason for such a conclusion.

किं कारणम्? What is the reason?

राजशब्दाद्धि भवान् षष्ठीमुच्चारयति । अङ्ग हि भवान् पुरुषशब्दादप्युच्चारयतु, गंस्यते सोऽर्थः

Oh, you read *ṣaṣṭhī* after *rājan*. You better use, sir, the same after *puruṣa* also, and the same meaning is found

ननु च नैतेनैवं भवितव्यम् - न हि शब्दकृतेन नामार्थेन भवितव्यम्, अर्थकृतेन नाम शब्देन भवितव्यम् ।

Oh, cannot we decide so on the basis that meaning should not be ascertained from the words used, but words have to be chosen to express the desired meaning?

तदेतदेवं दृश्यताम् - अर्थरूपमेवैतद् एवंजातीयकं येनात्र अन्तरेणापि पुरुष शब्दप्रयोगं राजनि सोऽर्थो गम्यते

Let it be taken so that word is chosen to suit the meaning. That meaning is suggested in *rājan* even if *puruṣa* is not read.

किं पुनस्तत्? What is it?

स्वामित्वम् The idea of *svāmitva*

किं कृतं पुनस्तत्? By which is it understood?

स्वकृतम् It is understood from its own capacity.

तद्यथा - प्रातिपदिकार्थानां क्रियाकृता विशेषा उपजायन्ते, तत्कृताश्च अन्याः प्रादुर्भवन्ति - कर्म, करणम्, अपादानं, सम्प्रदानम्, अधिकरणम् इति । ताश्च पुनर्विभक्तीनामुत्पत्तौ कदाचिन्निमित्तत्वेनोपादीयन्ते कदाचिन्न ।

This is explained thus: Some *viśēṣas* in the meanings of *prātipadikas* through their *vyāpāra* are taken cognisance of and from them, names like *karma*, *karaṇam*, *apādānam*, *sampradānam* and *adhikaraṇam* are given. They sometimes serve as *nimitta* to choose the case suffixes and sometimes do not.

कदा च विभक्तीनामुत्पत्तौ निमित्तत्वेन नोपादीयन्ते ?

When do they not serve as *nimitta* to choose the case-suffixes ?

यदा व्यभिचरन्ति प्रातिपदिकार्थम्

When they (*śakti-viśēṣas*) are outside the sphere of *prātipadikārtha*.

यदा हि न व्यभिचरन्ति, आख्याभूता एव तदा भवन्ति - कर्म, करणम्, अपादानं, सम्प्रदानं, अधिकरणम् इति

When they are within the sphere of *prātipadikārtha*, *karma*, *karaṇam*, *apādānam*, *sampradānam* and *adhikaraṇam* serve as mere names denoting the function of case-suffixes.

यथैव तर्हि राजनि स्वकृतं स्वामित्वं तत्र षष्ठी भवति, एवं पुरुषेऽपि स्वामिकृतं स्वत्वं तत्र षष्ठी प्राप्नोति ।

Just as *ṣaṣṭhī* is used after *rājan* on the basis that there is *svāmitva* created by himself in him, there is chance for the same *ṣaṣṭhī* to be used after *puruṣa*, since there is *svatva* in him created by *svāmitva*.

राजशब्दाद् उत्पद्यमानया षष्ठ्या अभिहितः सोऽर्थ इति कृत्वा पुरुषशब्दात् षष्ठी न भविष्यति

Since that meaning-*sva-svāmitva-sambandha* has been expressed by the *ṣaṣṭhī* after *rājan*, it cannot be used after *puruṣa*.

न तर्हि इदानीमिदं भवति - पुरुषस्य राजा इति

If so, is there no chance for the expression *Puruṣasya rājā* ?

भवति । राजशब्दात्तु तदा प्रथमा

Yes, it has. *Prathamā* alone can then be used after *rājan*.

न तर्हि इदानीमिदं भवति राज्ञः पुरुषस्य इति ?

If so, is there is no chance for the expression *Rājñaḥ puruṣasya* ?

भवति वाक्यमर्थमभिसमीक्ष्य

Yes, it has a chance, on considering its relation with an external object.

NOTE :–If *puruṣa* subordinates itself by governing another, it takes *ṣaṣṭhī* after it, even though it is *pradhāna* with reference to *rājan*.

अधीगर्थदयेशां कर्मणि (2, 3, 52)

कर्मादिष्वकर्मकवद्वचनम्

Need to read *akarmakavad* with reference to the *āśrayas* of *karma*.

कर्मादिष्वकर्मकवद्भावो वक्तव्यः

Akarmakavadbhāva has to be enjoined with reference to the *āśrayas* of *karma*, (the *dhātus* read in the *sūtras* from 2, 3, 52 to 2, 3, 61.)

किं प्रयोजनम्? What is the benefit?

अकर्मकाणां भावे लो भवति इति भावे लो यथा स्यात् - मातुः सर्यते, पितुः सर्यते इति

So that the expressions *Mātuḥ smaryatē* and *Pituḥ smaryatē* in *bhāvē-prayōga* on the authority of *Akarmakāṇām bhāvē lō bhavati* may be secured.

अथ वत्करणं किमर्थम्? What is the purpose served by *vat*?

स्वाश्रयमपि यथा स्यात् - माता सर्यते, पिता सर्यते इति

So that the expressions *Mātā smaryatē* and *pitā smaryatē* based on *karmaṇi-prayōga* also may be secured.

कर्माभिधाने हि लिङ्गवचनानुपपत्तिः

For in the absence of *akarmakavadbhāva*, there will be *anupapatti* of *liṅga* and *vacana*.

कर्माभिधाने हि सति लिङ्गवचनयोरनुपपत्तिः स्यात् - मातुः स्मृतम्, मात्रोः स्मृतम्, मातॄणां स्मृतम् इति । मातुर्यल्लिङ्गं वचनं तत् स्मृतशब्दस्यापि प्राप्नोति ।

If *akarmakavadbhāva* is not read, the *liṅga* (*napuṁsaka*) and *vacana* (*ēkavacana*) after the word *smṛta* in *Mātuḥ smṛtam*, *Mātrōḥ smṛtam* and *Mātṝṇām smṛtam* may not be appropriate,

since it will have to take the *liṅga* and the *vacana* of *mātṛ* that precedes it.

षष्ठीप्रसङ्गश्च Chance too for *ṣaṣṭhī*.

षष्ठी च प्राप्नोति There is chance for *ṣaṣṭhī* too to appear.

कुतः? After what?

स्मृतशब्दात्, मातुः सामानाधिकरण्यात् षष्ठी प्राप्नोति
After the word *smṛta* which is *samānādhikaraṇa* with *mātṛ*.

अपर आह Another says.

षष्ठीप्रसङ्गश्च Need to make *ṣaṣṭhī* to appear.

षष्ठी च प्रसङ्क्तव्या There is need to make *ṣaṣṭhī* appear.

कुतः? After what?

मातृशब्दात् । स्मृतशब्देनाभिहितं कर्मेति कृत्वा षष्ठी न प्राप्नोति
After the word *mātṛ*. There will be no chance for *ṣaṣṭhī*, since *karmatva* is expressed by the *smṛta*.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It (*akarmakavat*) has to be enjoined then.

न वक्तव्यम् । अविवक्षिते कर्मणि षष्ठी भवति
No, it need not be enjoined. *Ṣaṣṭhī* sets in where there is no *vivakṣā* for *karma*.

किं वक्तव्यमेतत्? Is this to be stated?

न हि No, it need not.

कथमनुच्यमानं गंस्यते
How is it to be so understood without its being stated?

शेष इति वर्तते There is *anuvṛtti* for *śēṣē*.

शेषश्च कः? What does the word *śēṣa* connote?

कर्मादीनामविवक्षा शेषः
The word *śēṣa* connotes the *avivakṣā* of *karmādis*.

यदा च कर्म विवक्षितं भवति, तदा षष्ठी न भवति - तद्यथा, स्मराम्यहं मातरं, स्मराम्यहं पितरं इति ।
When there is *vivakṣā* for *karmatva*, *ṣaṣṭhī* does not set in, as in *Smarāmi aham mātaram* and *Smarāmi aham pitaram*.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* clearly explains how *bhāvavacanānām* means *bhāvakartṛkāṇām*.

रुजार्थानां भाववचनानामज्वरेः (2, 3, 54)

अज्वरिसन्ताप्योः Need to replace *Ajvarēḥ* by *Ajvari-santāpyōḥ.*

अज्वरिसन्ताप्योरिति वक्तव्यम्, इहापि यथा स्यात् चोरं सन्तापयति, वृषलं सन्तापयति

Ajvarisantāpyōḥ is to be read, so that the expressions *Cōram santāpayati* and *Vṛṣalam santāpayati* may be secured.

अथ किमर्थं भाववचनानाम् इत्युच्यते, यावता रुजार्था भाववचना एव भवन्ति!
What is the need for the word *bhāvavacanānām* when *rujārthas* are only *bhāvavacanas*?

भावकर्तृकाद् यथा स्यात्, इह मा भूत् - नदी कूलानि रुजति इति
So that it may be after *bhāvakartṛka*, so as to prevent its operation here in *Nadī kūlāni rujati.*

द्वितीया ब्राह्मणे (2, 3, 60)

किमुदाहरणम्? What is the example?

गां घ्नन्ति, गां प्रदीव्यन्ति, गां सभासद्भ्य उपहरन्ति
The examples are :-*Gām ghnanti, gām pradīvyanti.* and *gām sabhāsadbhya upaharanti.*

नैतदस्ति, पूर्वेणाप्येतत् सिद्धम्
No. this is not; this is secured even by the previous *sūtra* (*Vibhāṣōpasargē*).

इदं तर्हि, गामस्य तदहः सभायां दीव्येयुः
This, then, is the example :-*Gām asya tad-ahaḥ sabhāyām dīvyēyuḥ.*

प्रेष्यब्रुवोर्हविषो देवतासम्प्रदाने (2, 3, 61)

हविषोऽप्रस्थितस्य

चतुर्थ्यर्थे बहुलं छन्दसि (2, 3, 62)

षष्ठ्यर्थे चतुर्थी [1] Need to read *Ṣaṣṭhyarthē caturthī*.

षष्ठ्यर्थे चतुर्थी वक्तव्या - या खर्वेण पिबति तस्यै खर्वः (जायते)

There is need to read *Ṣaṣṭhyarthē caturthī*, to sanction *tasyāi* for *tasyāḥ* in *Yā kharvēṇa pibati tasyāi kharvaḥ* (*jāyatē*).

यां मलवद्वाससं सम्भवन्ति यस्ततो जायते सोऽभिशस्तः, यामरण्ये तस्यै स्तेनो यां पराचीं तस्यै ह्रीतमुख्यपगल्भो या स्नाति तस्या अप्सुमारको, या अभ्यङ्क्ते तस्यै दुश्चर्मा, या प्रलिखते तस्यै खलतिरपमारी, या अङ्क्ते तस्यै काणः, या दतो धावते तस्यै श्यावदन्, या नखानि निकृन्तते तस्यै कुनखी, या कृणत्ति तस्यै क्लीबः, या रज्जुं सृजति तस्या उद्बन्धुको, या पर्णेन पिबति तस्या उन्मादुकः ॥ तैत्तिरीयसंहिता (2, 5, 1, 6-7) अहल्यायै जारः (तै. आर. 1, 58), मनाय्यै तन्तुः

In the following *Vēdic* quotation the fourth case in *tasyāi*, *Ahalyāyāi* and *Manāyyāi* is found in place of genetive:— *Yām malavadvāsasam sambhavanti yas tatō jāyatē sōsbhiśastaḥ, yām araṇyē tasyāi stēnaḥ, yām parācīm tasyāi hrītamukhyapa-galbhaḥ, yā snāti tasyāi apsumārakaḥ, yā abhyaṅktē tasyāi duścarmā, yā pralikhatē tasyāi khalatir-apamārī, yā aṅktē tasyāi kōṇaḥ, yā datō dhāvatē tasyāi śyāvadan, yā nakhāni nikṛntatē tasyāi kunakhī, yā kṛṇatti tasyāi klībaḥ, yā rajjum sṛjati tasyā udbandhukaḥ, yā parṇēna pibati tasyā unmādukaḥ. Ahalyāyāi jāraḥ, Manāyyāi tantuḥ.*[2]

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be enjoined.

न वक्तव्यम् No, it need not.

योगविभागात् सिद्धम्
It is accomplished by splitting the *sūtra* into two.

1. *Caturthīvacanam* is another reading.

2. This passage in the *Tāittirīyasaṁhitā* tells us how advanced the Science of Psychology was in *Vēdic* times and how careful the wife should be when she is in her manses.

चतुर्थी । ततः, अर्थे बहुलं छन्दसि
First *Caturthī* is taken as one *sūtra* and then *Arthē bahulam chandasi* is taken as another *sūtra*.

कर्तृकर्मणोः कृति (2, 3, 65)

Whether there is need for the use of the word *kṛti* in the *sūtra* is the only topic that is discussed here.

कृद्ग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is *kṛti* read?

इह मा भूत् - पचत्योदनं देवदत्त इति
So that the *sūtra* may not operate here when a finite verb like *pacati* as in *Pacati ōdanam Dēvadattaḥ* is read.

कर्तृकर्मणोः षष्ठीविधाने कृद्ग्रहणानर्थक्यं लप्रतिषेधात्
Reading of *kṛti* with reference to *ṣaṣṭhīvidhāna* of *kartṛ* and *karman* is unnecessary, on account of the *niṣēdha* of *lakāra*.

कर्तृकर्मणोः षष्ठीविधाने कृद्ग्रहणमनर्थकम्
Reading of *kṛti* is unnecessary with reference to the *vidhāna* of *ṣaṣṭhī* of *kartṛ* and *karman*.

किं कारणम्? Why?

लप्रतिषेधात् । प्रतिषिध्यतेऽत्र षष्ठी लप्रयोगे न इति
On account of the prohibition before *lakāra*. *Ṣaṣṭhī* is going to be prohibited when *lakāra* is used, in the *sūtra Na lōka*... (2, 3, 69).

तस्य कर्मकर्त्रर्थं तर्हि कृद्ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । कृतो ये कर्तृकर्मणी तत्र यथा स्यादन्यस्य ये कर्तृकर्मणी तत्र मा भूदिति ।
There is need for the word *kṛti*, so that it may serve as the *viśēṣaṇa* of *karmakartṛ*, to allow the *sūtra* to operate with reference to the *kartṛ* and *karman* of *kṛt* and not with reference to those of another.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । धातोर्हि द्वये प्रत्यया विधीयन्ते, तिङश्च कृतश्च । तत्र कृत्प्रयोग इष्यते, तिङ्प्रयोगे प्रतिषिध्यते ।
This is not the benefit; for, two kinds of *pratyayas—tiṅ* and *kṛt* are enjoined to roots. Of them, this *sūtra* is intended to operate if *kṛt-pratyaya* is used and not to operate if *tiṅ* is used.

न ब्रूमः - इहार्थं तस्य कर्मकर्त्रर्थं कृद्ग्रहणं कर्तव्यमिति

We do not say that the word *kṛti* should be used to serve as the *viśēṣaṇa* of *kartṛkarmaṇōḥ* in this *sūtra*.

किं तर्हि ? Where then?

उत्तरार्थम् - [1] अव्ययप्रयोगे न इति षष्ठ्याः प्रतिषेधं वक्ष्यति, स कृतोऽव्ययस्य ये कर्तृकर्मणी तत्र यथा स्याद्, अकृतोऽव्ययस्य ये कर्तृकर्मणी तत्र मा भूत् - उच्चैः कटानां स्रष्टा इति ।

For the sake of what follows. He is going to prohibit *ṣaṣṭhī* with reference to the *prayōga* of *avyaya*. It should apply to the *kartṛ* and *karman* of the *avyaya* which is *kṛt* and should not apply to the *kartṛ* and *karman* to other *avyayas*, so that the following expression can be secured—*Uccāiḥ kaṭānām sraṣṭā*.

तस्य कर्मकर्त्रर्थमिति चेत् प्रतिषेधेऽपि तदन्तकर्मकर्तृत्वात्सिद्धम्

If it is said that *kṛt* is to serve as the *viśēṣaṇa* of *karmakartṛ* with reference to *avyaya*, the object is achieved since the *avyaya* which takes *kartṛ* and *karman* is only *kṛd-anta*.

कृत एते कर्तृकर्मणी, नाव्ययस्य, अधिकरणमत्राव्ययम् ।

Kartṛ and *karman* belong only to *kṛdanta* and not to *avyaya*; *avyaya*, here (*uccāiḥ*) is only *adhikaraṇa*.

इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् - उभयप्राप्तौ कर्मणि षष्ठ्याः प्रतिषेधं वक्ष्यति, स कृतो ये कर्तृकर्मणी तत्र यथा स्यात् कृतोर्थे कर्तृकर्मणी तत्र मा भूदिति - आश्चर्यमिदं वृत्तम्, ओदनस्य च नाम पाकः, ब्राह्मणानां च प्रादुर्भाव इति

This, then, is the benefit, that the *pratiṣēdha* which he is going to enjoin with reference to *ṣaṣṭhī* in the *sūtra Ubhayaprāptāu karmaṇi* may apply to the *kartṛ* and *karman* of the same *kṛdanta* and not to the *kartṛ* and *karman* of two *kṛts*, as in *Āścaryam idam vṛttam, ōdanasya ca nāma pākaḥ, brāhmaṇānāñ ca prādurbhāvaḥ* (This is a strange occurrence—Oh, there is cooking of food and there is the arrival of brahmans)

अथ क्रियमाणेपि कृद्ग्रहणे कस्मादेवात्र न भवति ?

1. अव्ययीयोगे is another reading.

Even on reading the word *kṛti*, how does it (the *sūtra* - *Ubhaya-prāptāu karmaṇi*) not operate here?

उभयप्राप्तौ इति नैवं विज्ञायते - उभयोः प्राप्तिः उभयप्राप्तिः, उभयप्राप्तौ इति
The word *ubhayaprāptāu* is not taken as the seventh case of *ubhayaprāpti* whose *vigraha* is *ubhayōḥ prāptiḥ*.

कथं तर्हि? How then?

उभयोः प्राप्तिर्यस्मिन् कृति सोऽयमुभयप्राप्तिः कृत्, उभयप्राप्तौ इति ।
It is taken as the seventh case of *ubhayaprāpti* which qualifies *kṛt* and whose *vigraha* is *ubhayōḥ prāptiḥ yasmin*.

अथ वा कृतो ये कर्तृकर्मणी तत्र यथा स्यात्, तद्धितस्य ये कर्तृकर्मणी तत्र मा भूदिति - कृतपूर्वी कटं, भुक्तपूर्वी ओदनम् इति ।
Or, in order that it may operate with reference to the *kartṛ* and *karman* of *kṛdanta* alone and not to those of *taddhitānta*, as in *kṛtapūrvī kaṭam*, *bhuktapūrvī ōdanam*.

ननु च वाक्येनैवानेन न भवितव्यम्
Oh, there is no chance for *ṣaṣṭhī* from the nature of the sentence.

तत्र द्वितीयया तावन्न भवितव्यम्
Oh! there is no chance even for *dvitīyā* there (after *kaṭa* and *ōdana*.)

किं कारणम्? Why?

क्तेनाभिहितं कर्मेति कृत्वा
Taking that *karman* is expressed by *kta*.

इनिप्रत्ययेन चापि नोत्पत्तव्यम्
There is no chance for *ini-pratyaya* too to appear.

किं कारणम्? Why?

असामर्थ्यात् On account of the absence of *sāmarthya*.

कथमसामर्थ्यम्? Why is *sāmarthya* absent?

सापेक्षमसमर्थं भवति
On the dictum *Sāpēkṣam asamartham bhavati*.

यत्तावदुच्यते - द्वितीयया तावन्न भवितव्यम्, किं कारणम्, क्तेन अभिहितं कर्मेति कृत्वा - इति, योऽसौ कृतकटयोरभिसम्बन्धः स उत्पन्ने प्रत्यये निवर्तते; अस्ति च करोतेः कटेन सामर्थ्यम् इति कृत्वा द्वितीया भविष्यति ।

Firstly with reference to the objection that there is no chance for *dvitīyā* after *kaṭa* on account of the *karmatva* being expressed by *kta*, the *sambandha* between *kṛta* and *kaṭa* recedes from the mind the moment *ini-pratyaya* is used and *dvitīyā*, then, sets in on the assumption that there is *sāmarthya* between the meaning of the root *kṛ* and *kaṭa*.

यदप्युच्यते - इनिप्रत्ययेन चापि नोत्पत्तव्यम्, किं कारणम्, असामर्थ्यात्, कथमसामर्थ्यम्, सापेक्षमसमर्थं भवति - इति, नेदमुभयं युगपद् भवति वाक्यं प्रत्ययश्च; यदा वाक्यं न तदा प्रत्ययः; यदा प्रत्ययः सामान्येन तदा वृत्तिः । तत्र अवश्यं विशेषार्थिना विशेषोऽनुप्रयोक्तव्यः - कृतपूर्वी । किम्? कटमिति । भुक्तपूर्वी - किम्? ओदनमिति

With reference to the second objection too that there is no chance for *ini-pratyaya* on account of *asāmarthya* which is based on *sāpēkṣatva*, the answer is this :- Both the *vākya* and the *pratyaya* do not operate simultaneously; when the *vākya* operates, *pratyaya* does not. When the *pratyaya* makes its appearance, it has its *vṛtti* [1] only in a general sense and hence one who is bent upon informing the *viśēṣa* has to make use of *viśēṣa*. On saying *kṛtapūrvī*, he gives room for the object of *kṛta* to be known and hence reads *kaṭam*. Similarly he reads *ōdanam* after *bhuktapūrvī*.

अथ वा इदं प्रयोजनम् - कर्तृभूतपूर्वमात्रादपि षष्ठी यथा स्यात् भेदिका देवदत्तस्य यज्ञदत्तस्य काष्ठानाम् इति

Or this is the benefit that *ṣaṣṭhī* may be used after *prayōjya-kartṛ* as *Bhēdikā Dēvadattasya Yajñadattasya kāṣṭhānām*.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* derives *Kṛt* as *Kartari iti* and states that it refers to *prayōjyakartā* who is *apradhāna*. *Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* says that *taddhitanivṛtti* alone is the *prayōjana* of *kṛdgrahaṇa*.

1. *Vṛttiḥ = Parārthābhidhānam.*

उभयप्राप्तौ कर्मणि (2, 3, 66)

उभयप्राप्तौ कर्मणि षष्ठ्याः प्रतिषेधेऽकादिप्रयोगेऽप्रतिषेधः

There is need for *apratiṣēdha* with reference to those which end in *aka* etc. under the *sūtra Ubhayaprāptāu karmaṇi.*

उभयप्राप्तौ कर्मणि षष्ठ्याः प्रतिषेधे अकादिप्रयोगे प्रतिषेधो न भवतीति वक्तव्यम् – भेदिका देवदत्तस्य काष्ठानाम्, चिकीर्षा विष्णुमित्रस्य कटस्य

It must be enjoined that the *pratiṣēdha* of *ṣaṣṭhī* to the *kartṛ* by the *sūtra Ubhayaprāptāu karmaṇi* does not hold good if the *kṛt* is *aka* etc. *Viz. Bhēdikā Dēvadattasya kāṣṭhānām, cikīrṣā Viṣṇumitrasya kaṭasya.*

अपर आह Another says :

अकाकारयोः प्रयोगे प्रतिषेधो नेति वक्तव्यं, शेषे विभाषा

It must be enjoined that the *pratiṣēdha* does not hold good if the *kṛt* is *aka*, and *ā* and there is *vibhāṣā* with reference to the rest.

शोभना खलु पाणिनेः सूत्रस्य कृतिः, शोभना खलु पाणिनिना सूत्रस्य कृतिः । शोभना खलु दाक्षायणस्य सङ्ग्रहस्य कृतिः, शोभना खलु दाक्षायणेन सङ्ग्रहस्य कृतिः इति ।

Viz. Śōbhanā khalu Pāṇinēḥ Sūtrasya kṛtiḥ, Śōbhanā khalu Pāṇininā Sūtrasya kṛtiḥ. Śōbhanā khalu Dākṣāyaṇasya Saṅgrahasya kṛtiḥ, Śōbhanā khalu[1] *Dākṣāyaṇēna Saṅgrahasya kṛtiḥ.*

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* reads :—*Akākāravyatiriktastrīpratyaya ēva nānyasminniti kēcid āhuḥ. Aparē tu pratyayamātrē akākāra-varjitē vikalpam icchanti—Śabdānām anuśāsanam Ācāryasya Ācāryēṇa vā iti.*

क्तस्य च वर्तमाने (2, 3, 67)

क्तस्य च वर्तमाने नपुंसके भाव उपसङ्ख्यानम्

There is need to add *Napuṁsakē bhāvē* to the *sūtra Ktasya ca vartamānē.*

1. This shows that *Vyāḍi*, the author of the *Saṅgraha* is a descendant of *Pāṇini*.

क्तस्य च वर्तमाने नपुंसके भाव उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - छात्रस्य हसितं, नटस्य भुक्तम्, मयूरस्य नृत्तम्, कोकिलस्य व्याहृतम् इति

There is need to add *Napuṁsakē bhāvē* under the *sūtra* *Ktasya ca vartamānē* to secure the forms *Chātrasya hasitam, Naṭasya bhuktam, Mayūrasya nṛttam* and *Kōkilasya vyāhṛtam*.

तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be read.

न वक्तव्यम् No, it need not be read.

शेषविज्ञानात् सिद्धम् [1] - शेषलक्षणात्र षष्ठी भविष्यति ।

It is accomplished through *śēṣē*. The *ṣaṣṭhī* will appear here on the strength of the *sūtra Śēṣē ṣaṣṭhī*.

शेष इत्युच्यते । कश्च शेषः ?

The word *śēṣē* is read. What does *śēṣa* connote ?

कर्मादीनामविवक्षा शेषः

Śēṣa connotes the *avivakṣā* of *karmādis*.

कथं पुनः सतो नाम अविवक्षा स्यात्, यदा छात्रो हसति, नटो भुङ्क्ते, मयूरो नृत्यति, कोकिलो व्याहरति ?

How is it possible to have *avivakṣā* of that which exists, as *Chātrō hasati, Naṭō bhuṅktē, Mayūrō nṛtyati* and *Kōkilō vyāharati* ?

सतोऽप्यविवक्षा भवति । तद्यथा - अलोमिका एडका, अनुदरा कन्या इति । असतश्च विवक्षा - समुद्रः कुण्डिका, विन्ध्यो वर्द्धितकम् इति

Sometimes even things that do exist are not taken cognizance of as in *Alōmikā ēḍakā* and *Anudarā kanyā*. Sometimes even those which do not exist are expressed as in *Kuṇḍikā samudraḥ* and *Varddhitakam vindhyaḥ*.

यद्येवम् उत्तरत्र चातुःशब्द्यं प्राप्नोति - इदमहेः सृप्तम्, इहाहिना सृप्तम्, इहाहिः सृप्तः, इहाहेः सृप्तम्, ग्रामस्य पार्श्वे, ग्रामस्य मध्ये इति

If so, there will be chance for the following four-fold expression :—(1) *Idam ahēḥ sṛptam grāmasya pārśvē, grāmasya madhyē* (2) *Iha ahinā sṛptam...* (3) *Iha ahiḥ sṛptam...* (4) *Iha ahēḥ sṛptam...*

1. This is printed as a *vārttika* in the printed editions. But, in the opinion of *Nāgēśabhaṭṭa*, it seems to be *bhāṣya*.

इष्यत एव चातुःशब्द्यम्

The four-fold expression is evidently a desired one.

NOTE:—*Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* says that, according to *Vārttikakāra*, the ways of expression are three, that, according to *Mahābhāṣyakāra*, they are four and that, according to some, they are five.

न लोकाव्ययनिष्ठाखलर्थतृनाम् (2, 3, 69)

लादेशे सल्लिड्ग्रहणं किकिनोः प्रतिषेधार्थम्

Need to replace *la* by *sallit* to prohibit *ki* and *kin*.

लादेशे सल्लिड्ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् - सल्लिटोः प्रयोगे नेति वक्तव्यम्

It is necessary to read *sallit* in place of *la*. It must be enjoined that there is *pratiṣēdha* when *sat* and *liṭ* are used.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *sad* refers to *śatṛ* and *śānac* and *liṭ* refers to *kānac* and *kvas*.

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why?

किकिनोः प्रतिषेधार्थम् - किकिनोरपि प्रयोगे प्रतिषेधो यथा स्यात्, पपिः सोमम्, ददिर्गाः

To prohibit with reference to *ki* and *kin*. So that the *pratiṣēdha* may take place when *ki* and *kin* also are used, as in *Papiḥ sōmam* and *Dadir gāḥ*.

किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति?

How is it not secured from the *sūtra*?

तयोरलादेशत्वात् On account of their not being *lādēśa*.

न हि तौ लादेशौ For those two are not the *ādēśas* of *lakāra*.

अथ तो लादेशौ स्यातां, स्यात्प्रतिषेधः?

Can there be *pratiṣēdha* if they are *lādēśa*?

बाढं स्यात् Certainly will it be.

लादेशौ तर्हि भविष्यतः If so, they are taken as *lādēśa*.

कथम्? How?

आदृगमहनजनः किकिनौ लिट् च इति, लिड्वदिति वक्ष्यामि

I shall take *liṭ ca* in the *sūtra* *Ā-dṛ-gama hana-janaḥ kikināu liṭ ca* (3, 2, 171) in the sense of *liḍvat.*

स तर्हि वतिनिर्देशः कर्तव्यः, न ह्यन्तरेण वतिमतिदेशो गम्यते

If so, *vat* has to be read; for *atidēśa* is not possible without *vat.*

अन्तरेणापि वतिमतिदेशो गम्यते । तद्यथा, एष ब्रह्मदत्तः, अब्रह्मदत्तं ब्रह्मदत्त इत्याह, ते मन्यामहे ब्रह्मदत्तवदयं भवतीति । एवमिहाप्यलिटं लिडित्याह, लिड्वदिति विज्ञास्यते ।

Atidēśa is suggested even in the absence of *vat.* For instance, one, on seeing a person who is not *Brahmadatta*, says, 'This man is *Brahmadatta*' and we infer from it that he is like *Brahmadatta.* So also he reads *aliṭ* as *liṭ.* It is construed *liḍvat.*

उकारप्रयोगे न Need to prohibit where *ukāra* is used.

उकारप्रयोगे नेति वक्तव्यम् - कटं चिकीर्षुः, ओदनं बुभुक्षुः ।

It is necessary to prohibit it with reference to *ukārānta.* *Viz.* *Kaṭam cikīrṣuḥ* and *ōdanam bubhukṣuḥ.*

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be read.

न वक्तव्यम् । उकारोप्यत्र निर्दिश्यते

It need not be read. *Ukāra*, too, is found in the *sūtra.*

कथम्? How?

प्रश्लिष्टनिर्देशोऽयम् - उ + उक = ऊक, ल + ऊक = लोक इति

The word *lōka* embraces within it *la*, *u* and *uka* where the latter two first combine to form *ūka.*

उकप्रतिषेधे कमेर्भाषायामप्रतिषेधः

Need for *apratiṣēdha* of *kāmuka* in Classical Sanskrit.

उकप्रतिषेधे कमेर्भाषायां प्रतिषेधो न भवतीति वक्तव्यम् - दास्याः कामुकः, वृषल्याः कामुकः ।

It must be enjoined that, with reference to *uka-pratiṣēdha*, there is no *pratiṣēdha* for *kāmuka* in Classical Sanskrit. *Viz.* *Dāsyāḥ kāmukaḥ* and *Vṛṣalyāḥ kāmukaḥ.*

अव्ययप्रतिषेधे तोसुन्कसुनोरप्रतिषेधः

Need for *apratiṣēdha* with reference to *tōsun* and *kasun*.

अव्ययप्रतिषेधे तोसुन्कसुनोः प्रतिषेधो न भवतीति वक्तव्यम् - पुरा सूर्यस्योदेतोराधेयः, पुरा वत्सानामपाकर्तोः, पुरा क्रूरस्य विसृपो विरप्शिन्

It must be enjoined that the *pratiṣēdha* with reference to *avyayas* does not embrace *tōsun* and *kasun*. *Viz. Purā sūryasya udētōr ādhēyaḥ, Purā vatsānām apākartōḥ* and *Purā krūrasya visṛpō virapśin*.

शानंश्चानश्शतृणामुपसङ्ख्यानम्

There is need to add *śānan, cānaś* and *śatṛ*.

शानंश्चानश्शतृणामुपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम्, सोमं पवमानः, नटमाघ्नानः, अधीयन् पारायणम् । लप्रयोगे न इति प्रतिषेधो न प्राप्नोति

There is need to add under the *sūtra śānan, cānaś* and *śatṛ* so that the *pratiṣēdha* may operate here :—*Sōmam pavamānaḥ, Naṭam āghnānaḥ*, and *Adhīyan pārāyaṇam*. These cannot be secured from the *pratiṣēdha laprayōgē na*.

मा भूदेवं; तृन्नित्येवं भविष्यति

Let it not be secured by it; it will be secured by *tṛn* found in the *sūtra*.

कथम्? How?

तृन्निति नेदं प्रत्ययग्रहणम् *Tṛn*, here, is not the *pratyaya*.

किं तर्हि? What, then, is it?

प्रत्याहारग्रहणम् It is *pratyāhāra*.

क्व सन्निविष्टानां प्रत्याहारः? Whose *pratyāhāra* is it?

लटः शतृ इत्यतः प्रभृति आतृनो नकारात्

It is the *pratyāhāra* from *tṛ* in *Laṭaḥ śatṛ*... (3, 2, 124) to *n* in *Tṛn* (3, 2, 135).

यदि प्रत्याहारग्रहणं चोरस्य द्विषन्, वृषलस्य द्विषन् अत्रापि प्राप्नोति ।

If it refers to *pratyāhāra*, the *pratiṣēdha* will have chance here also in *Cōrasya dviṣan* and *Vṛṣalasya dviṣan*.

द्विषः शतुर्वावचनम् There is need to read *Dviṣaḥ śaturvā*.

द्विषः शतुर्वेति वक्तव्यम् । तच्चावश्यं वक्तव्यम्, प्रत्ययग्रहणे सति प्रतिषेधार्थं, तदेव प्रत्याहारग्रहणे सति विध्यर्थं भविष्यति

There is need to state *Dviṣaḥ śaturvā*. It must, necessarily be read for the sake of *pratiṣēdha* if *tṛn* is taken as a *pratyaya* and for the sake of *vidhi* if *tṛn* is taken as a *pratyāhāra*.

अकेनोर्भविष्यदाधमर्ण्ययोः (2, 3, 70)

अकस्य भविष्यति Need to restrict *aka* only to *bhaviṣyati*.

अकस्य भविष्यतीति वक्तव्यम् - यवान् लावको व्रजति, ओदनं भोजको व्रजति, सक्तून् पायको व्रजति

There is need to restrict *aka* only to *bhaviṣyati*, *Viz. Yavān lāvakō vrajati*, *Ōdanam bhōjakō vrajati* and *Saktūn pāyakōl vrajati*.

इन आधमर्ण्ये च *In* in the sense of *ādhamarṇya* too.

तत इन आधमर्ण्ये च भविष्यति चेति वक्तव्यम् - शतं दायी, सहस्रं दायी, ग्रामं गमी ।

Then it is necessary to enjoin that *in* is used to denote *ādhamarṇya* in addition to *bhaviṣyati*.

कृत्यानां कर्तरि वा (2, 3, 71)

कर्तृग्रहणं किमर्थम्? Why is *kartari* read?

कर्मणि मा भूदिति To prevent it in *karmaṇi*.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । भावकर्मणोः कृत्या विधीयन्ते, तत्र कृत्यैरभिहितत्वात् कर्मणि षष्ठी न भविष्यति

This is not the benefit. *Kṛtyapratyayas* are enjoined to denote *bhāva* and *karman*, and since *karman* is expressed by *kṛtyas*, there is no chance for *karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī*.

अत उत्तरं पठति He, then, reads the answer.

भव्यादीनां कर्मणोऽनभिधानात् कृत्यानां कर्तृग्रहणम्

Since *karman* is not expressed by *kṛtya* in *bhavyādi* noted in 3, 4, 68, *kartari* is read in the *sūtra.*

भव्यादीनां कर्म कृत्यैरनभिहितम् - गेयो माणवकः साम्नाम्

The *karman* of *bhavyādis* is not expressed by *kṛtya. Gēyō māṇavakaḥ sāmnām.*

भव्यादीनां कर्मणोऽनभिधानात् कृत्यानां कर्तृग्रहणं क्रियते

Since the *karman* of *bhavyādis* is not expressed, there is need to read *kartari* in the *sūtra.*

किमुच्यते - भव्यादीनां कर्म कृत्यैरनभिहितम् इति, नेहाप्यनभिहितं भवति, आकष्टव्या ग्रामं शाखा इति ?

Why is it said that the *karman* of *bhavyādis* is not expressed by *kṛtyas*? Is it not that it is not expressed even here in the sentence *Ākraṣṭavyā grāmam śākhā*?

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says here :- *Kṛṣēr dvikarmakatvāt pradhānakarmaṇaḥ kṛtyēna abhidhānam, na tu apradhāna-karmaṇaḥ iti tannivṛttyartham kartṛgrahaṇam kasmān na bhavati iti bhāvaḥ.*

एवं तर्हि योगविभागः करिष्यते - कृत्यानाम् - कृत्यानां प्रयोगे षष्ठी न भवति इति ।

If so, the *sūtra* is split into two :- Firstly *kṛtyānām* is read and it means that *ṣaṣṭhī* does not appear when *kṛtyas* are used.

किमुदाहरणम् What is the *udāharaṇa*?

ग्राममाकष्टव्या शाखा *Grāmam ākraṣṭavyā śākhā.*

ततः कर्तरि वा इति Secondly *kartari vā* is read.

इहापि तर्हि प्राप्नोति, गेयो माणवकः साम्नामिति

If, so, the *niṣēdha* will appear here too in *Gēyō māṇavakaḥ sāmnām.*

उभयप्राप्ताविति वर्तते There is *anuvṛtti* for *ubhayaprāpti.*

ननु चोभयप्राप्तिरेवैषा - गेयो माणवकः साम्नाम् इति च, गेयानि माणवकेन सामानि इति च भवति

Oh this too is a case where there is *ubhayaprāpti* :- *Gēyō māṇavakaḥ sāmnām* and *Gēyāni māṇavakēna sāmāni.*

उभयप्राप्तिर्नाम सा भवति यत्रोभयस्य युगपत् प्रसङ्गः । अत्र च यदा कर्मणि न तदा कर्तरि, यदा कर्तरि न तदा कर्मणीति ॥

Ubhayaprāpti is that where both have a chance to appear simultaneously. Here when it comes with reference to *karman,* it does not come with reference to *kartṛ* and when it comes with reference to *kartṛ*, it does not come with reference to *karman.*

Āhnika - Twentysix ends.

(Second *adhyāya* third *pada* third *ahnika* ends.)

Āhnika — Twentyseven

(Second *adhyāya*, fourth *pāda*, first *āhnika*)

द्विगुरेकवचनम् (2, 4, 1)

The need or otherwise of this *sūtra* is discussed here.

किमर्थमिदमुच्यते ? Why is this read ?

प्रत्यधिकरणं वचनोत्पत्तेः सङ्ख्यासामानाधिकरण्याच्च द्विगोरेकवचनविधानम्

Injunction of singular number suffix to *dvigu* on account of *vacana* being related to each *dravya* and *dvigu* has *sāmānādhikaraṇya* with *saṅkhyāvacaka*.

प्रत्यधिकरणं वचनोत्पत्तिर्भवति

Number-suffix follows each *dravya-vācaka* stem.

किमिदं प्रत्यधिकरणम् इति ?

What does *pratyadhikaraṇam* mean ?

अधिकरणम् अधिकरणं प्रति - प्रत्यधिकरणम्

Pratyadhikaraṇam means with reference to each *dravya*.

सङ्ख्यासामानाधिकरण्याच्च - सङ्ख्यया बह्वर्थया चास्य सामानाधिकरण्यम् । प्रत्यधिकरणं वचनोत्पत्तेः सङ्ख्यासामानाधिकरण्याच्च बहुषु बहुवचनमिति बहुवचनं प्राप्नोति । इष्यते चैकवचनं स्यादिति । तच्चान्तरेण यत्नं न सिध्यति इति द्विगोरेकवचनविधानम्

On account of the stem being in *sāmānādhikaraṇya* with number-suffix also. There is *sāmānādhikaraṇya* between *dravya* and number which may be one, two or many. There is chance for plural number suffix on the strength of the *sūtra Bahuṣu bahuvacanam*, since each *dravya* has its number and both of them have *sāmānādhikaraṇya* ; but singular suffix is desired there. It cannot be accomplished without effort and hence is the *vidhāna* of *ēkavacana* to *dvigu*.

अस्ति प्रयोजनमेतत् ? Is this the benefit ?

किं तर्हीति ? What then ?

तत्रानुप्रयोगस्यैकवचनाभावोऽद्विगुत्वात्

If so, there is no chance for the singular suffix in *anuprayōga* (addition of one after another) on account of its not being *dvigu*.

तत्रानुप्रयोगस्यैकवचनं न प्राप्नोति पञ्चपूलीयम् इति

If so, singular suffix cannot be used in the *anuprayōga*, *pañcapūlīyam*.

किं कारणम् Why ?

अद्विगुत्वात् । द्विगुरेकवचनमित्युच्यते, न चात्र अनुप्रयोगो द्विगुसंज्ञः ।

On account of its not being *dvigu*. *Dvigu* is read to take *ēkavacana* and *anuprayōga*, here, does not have the *dvigu-saṁjñā*.

सिद्धं तु द्विग्वर्थस्यैकवद्वचनात्

It is accomplished by reading *dvigvartha* and *ēkavad* in place of *dvigu* and *ēkavacana*.

सिद्धमेतत् This is accomplished.

कथम्? How ?

द्विग्वर्थ एकवद्भवतीति वक्तव्यम्

Dvigvartha ēkavadbhavati should be read in place of *Dvigur-ēkavacanam*.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It, then, has to be read.

न वक्तव्यम् । नेदं पारिभाषिकस्य वचनस्य ग्रहणम्

No, it need not be so read. The word *vacana* here is not used in the technical sense of number.

किं तर्हि ? In what sense then ?

अन्वर्थग्रहणम् । उच्यते वचनम्, एकस्यार्थस्य वचनम् एकवचनम् इति

It is used in its derivative sense. The word *ēkavacana* means *ēkasya arthasya vacanam* (mention of one object) where the derivation of *vacanam* is *ucyatē*.

एकशेषप्रतिषेधश्च *Need to prohibit ēkavadbhāva.*

एकशेषस्य च प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - पञ्चपूली च पञ्चपूली च पञ्चपूली च पञ्चपूल्यः ।

There is need for *pratiṣēdha* with reference to *ēkavadbhāva* to secure *pañcapūlyaḥ* from *pañcapūlī ca pañcapūlī ca pañcapūlī ca*.

न वान्यस्यानेकत्वात्

No, it need not be prohibited on account of *anēkatva* belonging to another.

न वा वक्तव्यः No, it need not be enjoined.

किं कारणम्? Why?

अन्यस्यानेकत्वात् । नैतद् द्विगोरनेकत्वम्

On account of *anēkatva* belonging to another. This *anēkatva* does not belong to *dvigu*.

कस्य तर्हि? To what then?

द्विग्वर्थसमुदायस्य

To the collection which forms the meaning of *dvigu*.

समाहारग्रहणं च तद्धितार्थप्रतिषेधार्थम्

Need to read *samāhāra* to prohibit *taddhitārtha*.

समाहारग्रहणं च कर्तव्यम् There is need to read *samahārē*.

किं प्रयोजनम् Why?

तद्धितार्थप्रतिषेधार्थम् - तद्धितार्थे यो द्विगुः तस्य मा भूदिति - पञ्चकपालौ पञ्चकपाला इति

To prohibit *dvigu* having *taddhitārtha*. So that the *sūtra* may not operate with reference to *dvigu* having *taddhitārtha*, as *pañcakapālāu* and *pañcakapālāḥ*.

किं पुनरयं पञ्चकपालशब्दः प्रत्येकं परिसमाप्यते, आहोस्वित् समुदाये वर्तते?

Does the word *pañca-kapāla* refer to the *purōdaśa* placed on each *kapāla* separately or to that placed on all simultaneously?

किं चातः? What difference does it make?

यदि तावत् प्रत्येकं परिसमाप्यते, पुरस्तादेव चोदितं परिहृतं च

If it is taken to be *pratyēka-parisamāpti*, it was raised previously and answered (under 2, 1, 4).

अथ समुदाये वर्तते Suppose it is taken to be *samudāyavṛtti*,

न वा समाहारैकत्वात्

The end is not gained on account of *ēkatva* of *samāhāra*.

न चैतत् समाहारैकत्वादपि सिध्यति

No, the end is not gained since *samāhāra* is one.

एवं तर्हि, प्रत्येकं परिसमाप्यते

If so, *pratyēkaparisamāpti* is resorted to.

पुरस्तादेव चोदितं परिहृतं च

It was raised previously and answered.

अपर आह Another says:—

न वा समाहारैकत्वात्

The *sūtra* is not necessary on account of the *ēkatva* of *samāhāra*.

न वा योगारम्भेणैवार्थः No purpose is served by the *sūtra*.

किं कारणम्? Why?

समाहारैकत्वात्। एकोऽयमर्थः समाहारो नाम, तस्यैकत्वाद् एकवचनं भविष्यति।

On account of oneness of *samāhāra*. *Samāhāra* is one and on account of its oneness, singular suffix will be used.

द्वन्द्वश्च प्राणितूर्यसेनाङ्गानाम् (2, 4, 2)

प्राणितूर्यसेनाङ्गानां तत्पूर्वपदोत्तरपदग्रहणम्

With reference to *prāṇi-tūrya-sēnāṅgas*, need to enjoin that both the *pūrvapada* and the *uttarapada* should denote the *aṅga* of one and the same.

प्राणितूर्यसेनाङ्गानां तत्पूर्वपदोत्तरपदग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। प्राण्यङ्गानां प्राण्यङ्गैरिति वक्तव्यम्; तूर्याङ्गानां तूर्याङ्गैरिति वक्तव्यम्; सेनाङ्गानां सेनाङ्गैरिति वक्तव्यम्

There is need to enjoin, with reference to *prāṇi-tūrya-sēnāṅgas*, that the *pūrvapada* and the *uttarapada* should denote the *aṅga* of one and the same. It must be read that *prāṇyaṅgas* compound with *prāṇyṅgas*, *tūryāṅgas* with *tūryāṅgas* and *sēnāṅgas* with *sēnāṅgas*.

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why?

व्यतिकरो मा भूदिति

To prevent mixing up of the *aṅga* of one with that of another.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be so enjoined.

न वक्तव्यम् No, it need not.

योगविभागात्सिद्धम् It is accomplished by *sūtra-split.*

योगविभागः करिष्यते - द्वन्द्वश्च प्राण्यङ्गानाम् । ततः, तूर्याङ्गानाम्; ततः सेनाङ्गानाम् इति

The *sūtra* is split thus:—First *Dvandvaś ca prāṇyaṅgānām* is read; then *Tūryāṅgānām* and then *Sēnāṅgānām.*

स तर्हि योगविभागः कर्तव्यः

The *sūtra-split* has, then, to be done.

न कर्तव्यः । प्रत्येकमङ्गशब्दः परिसमाप्यते

No, it need not. The word *aṅga* is taken with each of them.

अनुवादे चरणानाम् (2, 4, 3)

इह कस्मान्न भवति - नन्दन्तु कठकालापाः, वर्धन्तां कठकौथुमाः?

Why does not the *sūtra* operate here, in *Nandantu kaṭha-kālāpāḥ* and *vardhantām kaṭhakāuthumāḥ?*

स्थेणोः Only in association with the roots *sthā* and *iṇ*

स्थेणोरिति वक्तव्यम्

It must be said that it appears only in association with the roots *sthā* and *iṇ*.

एवमपि तिष्ठन्तु कठकालापाः इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति

If so, it will operate here in *tiṣṭhantu kaṭhakālāpāḥ.*

अद्यतन्यां च Only in aorist.

अद्यतन्यां चेति वक्तव्यम् - उदगात् कठकालापं, प्रत्यष्ठात् कठकौथुमं, उदगात्कौमोदपैप्पलादम्

It must be enjoined only in aorist. *Viz. Udagāt kaṭhakālāpam, Pratyṣṭhāt kaṭhakāuthumam. Udagāt kāumōdapāippalādam.*

विशिष्टलिङ्गो नदीदेशोऽग्रामाः (2, 4, 7))

ग्रामप्रतिषेधे नगरप्रतिषेधः

Nagara should not be taken within the range of *grāma*.

अग्रामा इत्यत्र अनगराणामिति वक्तव्यम् - इह मा भूत् मधुरापाटलिपुत्रम् ।

Cities should be taken off the range of *grāmas* to avoid the prohibition in *Madhurāpāṭaliputram* (both being cities.)

उभयतश्च ग्रामाणाम्

Prohibition to *grāmas* both ways (i.e.) when both are *grāmas* or either of the two is a *grāma*.

उभयतश्च ग्रामाणां प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - शौर्यं च केतवता च शौर्यकेतवते ; जाम्बवं च शालूकिनी च जाम्बवशालूकिन्यौ

There is need to prohibit both ways with reference to *grāmas*:-*Śauryam ca kētavatā ca* = *śauryakētavatē ; jāmbavam ca śālūkinī ca* = *jāmbavaśālūkinyāu.*[1]

क्षुद्रजन्तवः (2, 4, 8)

क्षुद्रजन्तव इत्युच्यते । के क्षुद्रजन्तवः ?

Kṣudrajantavaḥ is read. What are *kṣudrajantus* ?

क्षोत्तव्या जन्तवः क्षुद्रजन्तवः

Kṣudrajantus are those that do not die tho' crushed under feet.

यद्येवं यूकालिक्षं कीटपिपीलिकं दंशमशकम् इति न सिध्यति

If so, the following forms *yūkālikṣam* (louse and nit), *kīṭa-pipīlikam* (worm and ant) *daṁśamaśakam* (gad-fly and mosquito) cannot be secured.

एवं तर्हि अनास्थिकाः क्षुद्रजन्तवः

If so, *kṣudrajantus* are those that have no bones.

अथ वा येषां स्वं शोणितं नास्ति ते क्षुद्रजन्तवः

Or *kṣudrajantus* are those which do not have blood of their own.

अथ वा येषामा सहस्रादञ्जलिर्न पूर्यते ते क्षुद्रजन्तवः

1. These two are examples where the former member is *nagara* and the latter, *grāma*.

Or *kṣudrajantus* are those which do not fill the hollow of the hands even though they are thousand in number.

अथ वा येषां गोचर्ममात्रं राशिं हत्वा न पतितो भवति ते क्षुद्रजन्तवः

Or *kṣudrajantus* are those by killing which occupying an area of *gōcarman* one does not become a *patita*.

अथ वा नकुलपर्यन्ताः क्षुद्रजन्तवः

Or *kṣudrajantus* are those in the list including mungoose.

येषां च विरोधः शाश्वतिकः (2, 4, 9)

किमर्थश्चकारः ? In which meaning is *cakāra* used ?

एवकारार्थश्चकारः । येषां विरोधः शाश्वतिकः तेषां द्वन्द्व एकवचनमेव यथा स्याद् यदन्यत् प्राप्नोति तन्मा भूदिति ।

Cakāra means *ēva*. Singular number alone may be used in the *dvandva* of those denoting permanent enemies and none else.

किञ्च अन्यत् प्राप्नोति ?

What is it other than the singular number that may appear ?

पशुशकुनिद्वन्द्वे विरोधिनां पूर्वविप्रतिषिद्धम् इत्युक्तं स पूर्वप्रतिषेधो न वक्तव्यो भवति

The *pūrvavipratiṣēdha* enjoined in *Paśu-śakunidvandvē virōdhinām pūrvavipratiṣidham* under (2,4,12) is unnecessary.

शूद्राणामनिरवसितानाम् (2, 4, 10)

अनिरवसितानाम् इत्युच्यते, कुतोऽनिरवसितानाम् ?

The word *aniravasitānām* is read in the *sūtra*. What is the place that is referred to from which they are not banished ?

आर्यावर्तादनिरवसितानाम्

The place from which they are not banished is *Āryāvarta*.

कः पुनरार्यावर्तः ? Which is, then, *Āryāvarta* ?

प्रागादर्शात्, प्रत्यक् कालकवनात्, दक्षिणेन हिमवन्तम्, उत्तरेण पारियात्रम्

The country to the east of *Ādarśa*, to the west of *Kālakavana*, to the south of the Himalayas and to the north of *Pāriyātra*.

यद्येवं किष्किन्धगन्धिकं शकयवनं शौर्यक्रौञ्चम् इति न सिध्यति

If so, the forms *Kiṣkindhagandhikam, śakayavanam* and *śāurya-krāuñcum* are not secured.

एवं तर्हि आर्यनिवासादनिरवसितानाम्

If so, it refers to those not banished from the residence of *āryas*

क पुनरार्यनिवासः ? Which is the place where *āryas* reside ?

ग्रामो घोषो नगरं संवाह इति *Grāma, ghōṣa, nagara* and *saṁvāha.*

NOTE :—*Ghōṣa* refers to the place where cattle is kept and *saṁvāha* to the place where merchants reside.

एवमपि य एते महान्तः संस्त्यायास्तेष्वभ्यन्तराश्चण्डाला मृतपाश्च वसन्ति तत्र चण्डालमृतपाः इति न सिध्यति ।

Even then, the form *caṇḍālamṛtapāḥ* is not secured to denote the dwelling of *caṇḍālas* and *mṛtapas* in outhouses of big houses.

एवं तर्हि यज्ञात् कर्मणोऽनिरवसितानाम्

If so, it refers to those not prevented from doing sacrifice.

एवमपि तक्षायस्कारं, रजकतन्तुवायम् इति न सिध्यति

If so, the forms *Takṣāyaskāram* and *rajakatantuvāyam* cannot be secured.

एवं तर्हि पात्राद् अनिरवसितानाम् । यैर्भुक्ते पात्रं संस्कारेण शुध्यति तेऽनिरवसिताः ; यैर्भुक्ते पात्रं संस्कारेणापि न शुध्यति ते निरवसिताः इति

If so, it refers to *pātrād aniravasitas. Aniravasitas* are those whose dining plates are considered fit for use after cleaning and *niravasitas* are those whose dining plates are not considered fit for further use even after ceremonial cleaning.

गवाश्वप्रभृतीनि च (2, 4, 11)

गवाश्वप्रभृतिषु यथोच्चरितं द्वन्द्ववृत्तम्

Dvandva-vyāpāra in *gavāśvam* etc. is as it is read in the *Gaṇapāṭha.*

गवाश्वप्रभृतिषु यथोच्चारितं द्वन्द्ववृत्तं द्रष्टव्यम् - गवाश्वम्, गवाविकम्, गवैडकम्

Dvandva-vyāpāra in *gavāśvam* etc. is to be observed as read in the *Gaṇapāṭha. Viz. Gavāśvam, gavāvikam, gavāiḍakam,*

विभाषा वृक्षमृगतृणधान्यव्यञ्जनपशुशकुन्यश्ववडवपूर्वापराधरोत्तराणाम् (2, 4, 12)

बहुप्रकृतिः फलसेनावनस्पतिमृगशकुनिक्षुद्रजन्तुधान्यतृणानाम्

Vibhāṣā of *ēkavacana* of the *dvandvas* where component parts are in plural number and denote *phala*, *sēnā*, *vanaspati*, *mṛga*, *śakuni*, *kṣudrajantu*, *dhānya* and *tṛṇa*.

फलसेनावनस्पतिमृगशकुनिक्षुद्रजन्तुधान्यतृणानाम् द्वन्द्वे विभाषैकवद्भवति बहुप्रकृतिरिति वक्तव्यम्

It must be enjoined that the *dvandvas* whose component parts are in plural number and which denote *phala*, *sēnā*, *vanaspati*, *mṛga*, *śakuni*, *kṣudrajantu*, *dhānya* and *tṛṇa* optionally take singular number.

फल - बदरामलकं, बदरामलकानि । सेना - हस्त्यश्वं, हस्त्यश्वाः । वनस्पति - प्लक्षन्यग्रोधं, प्लक्षन्यग्रोधाः । मृग - रुरुपृषतं, रुरुपृषताः । शकुनि - हंसचक्रवाकं, हंसचक्रवाकाः । क्षुद्रजन्तु - यूकालिक्षं, यूकालिक्षाः । धान्य - व्रीहियवं, व्रीहियवाः ; माषतिलं, माषतिलाः । तृण - कुशकाशं, कुशकाशाः ; शरशीर्षं, शरशीर्षाः

Phala – *Badarāmalakam*, *badarāmalakāni* ; *Sēnā* – *Hastyaśvam*, *hastyaśvāḥ* ; *Vanaspati* – *Plakṣanyagrōdham*, *plakṣanyagrōdhāḥ* ; *Mṛga* – *Ruruprṣatam*, *ruruprṣatāḥ* ; *Śakuni* - *Haṁsacakravākam*, *haṁsacakravākāḥ* ; *kṣudrajantu* - *yūkālikṣam*, *yūkālikṣāḥ* ; *dhānya* - *vrīhiyavam*, *vrīhiyavāḥ* ; *māṣatilam*, *māṣatilāḥ* ; *Tṛṇa* - *kuśakāśam*, *kuśakāśāḥ* ; *śaraśīrṣam*, *śaraśīrṣāḥ*.

किं प्रयोजनम् ? What is the purpose served by this *vārttika* ?

बहुप्रकृतिरेव यः, तत्र यथा स्यात्

To restrict it only to where the component parts are plural.

क्व मा भूत् ? Where should it not be ?

बदरामलके तिष्ठतः In *badarāmalakē tiṣṭhataḥ*.

किं पुनरनेन या प्राप्तिः सा नियम्यते, आहोस्विदविशेषेण ?

Does this restrict the application of those enjoined in this *sūtra* or in all the *sūtras* in this context ?

किञ्चातः ! What does it matter if it is one or the other ?

यद्यनेन या प्राप्तिः सा नियम्यते, प्लक्षन्यग्रोधौ - जातिरप्राणिनाम् इति नित्यो द्वन्द्वैकवद्भावः प्राप्नोति । अथ अविशेषेण, न दोषो भवति

If this serves as the *niyama* to what is enjoined in this *sūtra*, there is chance for *dvandva-ēkavadbhāva* alone in place of *plakṣanyagrōdhāu* by the *sūtra Jātir aprāṇinām*. If it serves as the *niyama* to what is enjoined in all the *sūtras* in the context, there will be no defect.

यथा न दोषः, तथास्तु

Let it be taken in the way free from any defect.

पशुशकुनिद्वन्द्वे विरोधिनां पूर्वविप्रतिषिद्धम्

Pūrvavipratiṣēdha with reference to the *dvandva* of *paśu* and *śakuni* which are enemies.

पशुशकुनिद्वन्द्वे विरोधिनां येषां च विरोधः शाश्वतिकः इत्येतद् भवति पूर्वविप्रतिषेधेन । पशुशकुनिद्वन्द्वस्य अवकाशः - महाजोरभ्रं, महाजोरभ्राः ; हंसचक्रवाकं, हंसचक्रवाकाः । येषां च विरोधः शाश्वतिकः इत्यस्यावकाशः - श्रमणब्राह्मणम् । इहोभयं प्राप्नोति - काकोलूकं, श्वशृगालम् इति । येषां च विरोधः शाश्वतिकः इत्येतद् भवति पूर्वविप्रतिषेधेन ॥

The *sūtra Yēṣām ca virōdhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ* will operate through *pūrvavipratiṣēdha* with reference to to the *dvandva* of words denoting *paśu* and *śakuni* which are natural enemies. The room for this *sūtra* dealing with *paśu-śakuni-d andva* is *mahājōrabhram, mahājōrabhrāḥ*; *haṁsacakravākam, haṁsacakravākāḥ*. The room for the *sūtra Yēśām ca virōdhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ* to operate is *śramaṇa-brāhmaṇam* Both have a chance to operate with reference to *kākōlūkam, śvaśṛgālam* and the *sūtra Yēṣām ca virōdhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ* operates through *pūrvavipratiṣēdha*.

स तर्हि पूर्वविप्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः

If so, *pūrvavipratiṣēdha* has to be enjoined.

न वक्तव्यः । उक्तं तत्र चकारकरणस्य प्रयोजनम् - येषां च विरोधः शाश्वतिकः तेषां द्वन्द्वे एकवचनमेव यथा स्याद् यदन्यत् प्राप्नोति तन्मा भूदिति ।

No, it need not. It was pointed out under the *sūtra Yēṣām ca virōdhah śāśvatikaḥ* that *cakāra* is read to suggest that only singular number will be used and none else in the *dvandva* of words denoting objects which are natural enemies.

अश्ववडवयोः पूर्वलिङ्गत्वात्पशुद्वन्द्वनपुंसकम्

Need to enjoin the *napuṁsakatva* of *paśudvandva* since the *liṅga* of the former is enjoined (in *Pūrvavad aśvavaḍavāu* 2, 4, 27).

अश्ववडवयोः पूर्वलिङ्गत्वात् पशुद्वन्द्वनपुंसकं भवति पूर्वविप्रतिषेधेन । अश्ववडवयोः पूर्वलिङ्गत्वस्यावकाशः – विभाषा पशुद्वन्द्वनपुंसकम् यदा न पशुद्वन्द्वनपुंसकं सोऽवकाशः – अश्ववडवौ । महाजोरभ्राः । पशुद्वन्द्वनपुंसकप्रसङ्ग उभयं प्राप्नोति, अश्ववडवं पशुद्वन्द्वनपुंसकं भवति पूर्वविप्रतिषेधेन ।

There is need to enjoin *paśu-dvandva napuṁsakatva* through *pūrvavipratiṣēdha* since *aśvavaḍavāu* takes the *liṅga* of the former member. Room for the *pūrvaliṅgatva* of the *dvandva* of *aśva* and *vaḍavā* is where *paśudvandvanapuṁsakatva* does not set in on account of its *vibhāṣā* - *Aśvavaḍavāu*. Room for *paśu-dvandva-napuṁsakatva* is *paśudvandvas* other than this — *Mahājōrabhram, mahājōrabhrāḥ*. Both have a chance when *paśudvandvanapuṁsakatva* begins to operate and it is to be enjoined that *paśudvandva-napuṁsakatva* sets in through *pūrva-vipratiṣēdha*.

स तर्हि पूर्वविप्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः

Then there is need to enjoin *pūrvavipratiṣēdha*.

न वक्तव्यः No, it need not.

प्रतिपदविधानात् सिद्धम्

It is accomplished on account of the injunction with reference to the particular words.

प्रतिपदमत्र नपुंसकं विधीयते – अश्ववडवपूर्वापर .... इति

Napuṁsakatva is enjoined here in the *sūtra* .... *Aśvavaḍava-pūrva-apara* .... to individual words.

एकवचनमनर्थकं समाहारैकत्वात्

Non-necessity of the *anuvṛtti* of *ēkavacanam* here from *Dvigur ēkavacanam* on account of oneness of *samāhāra*.

एकवद्भावोऽनर्थकः Injunction of *ēkavadbhāva* is unnecessary.

किं कारणम्? Why?

समाहारैकत्वात्। एकोऽयमर्थः समाहारो नाम। तस्यैकत्वाद् एकवचनं भविष्यति।
On account of oneness of *samāhāra*. The word *samāhāra* means collection. Since it is one, it takes singular number.

इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् - एवं विज्ञास्यामि - इह नित्यो विधिरिह विभाषेति
This, then, is the *prayōjana*. I shall state that the *ēkavadbhāva* is *nitya* in this *prakaraṇa* and there it is *vibhāṣā*.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् - आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति सर्वो द्वन्द्वो विभाषैकवद्भवति इति यदयं तिष्यपुनर्वस्वोर्नक्षत्रद्वन्द्वे बहुवचनस्य द्विवचनं नित्यम् इत्याह।
This is not the benefit. The procedure of *Ācārya* suggests that all *dvandvas* take *ēkavadbhāva* optionally, since he enjoins *dual number* alone in *tiṣya-punarvasū* in place of *plural* in *Tiṣya-punarvasvōr nakṣatradvandvē bahuvacanasya dvivacanam nityam.*

इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् - स नपुंसकमिति वक्ष्यामि इति
I shall say that the injunction of neuter gender is the benefit.

एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम्। लिङ्गमशिष्यं लोकाश्रयत्वाल्लिङ्गस्य
This, too, is not the benefit. The gender need not be enjoined since it is decided from usage.

न तर्हीदानीमिदं वक्तव्यम्? Is not this *sūtra* necessary then?

वक्तव्यं च The *sūtra* has to be read.

किं प्रयोजनम् Why?

पूर्वत्र नित्यार्थमुत्तरत्र व्यभिचारार्थं विभाषा वृक्षमृगेति
To enable the *sūtras* that precede to be *nitya* and *Vibhāṣā vṛkṣamṛga* .... and the next *sūtra*, to be *vibhāṣā* unlike them.

विभाषा समीपे (2, 4, 16)

किमुदाहरणम्?[1] What is gained from it?

1. *Udāharaṇaśabdō'pi prayōjanaparaḥ* (*Nāgēśa*).

उपदशं पाणिपादम्, उपदशाः पाणिपादाः

Upadaśam pāṇipādam and *upadaśāḥ pāṇipādāḥ* are secured.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम्। अयं द्वन्द्वैकवद्भाव आरभ्यते। तत्र कः प्रसङ्गो यदनुप्रयोगस्य स्यात्?

This is not the benefit. *Dvandva-ēkavadbhāva* is the point at issue here. What will appear in *anuprayōga*? other than this[1]

एवं तर्हि अव्ययस्य सङ्ख्यया अव्ययीभावोऽप्यारभ्यते, बहुव्रीहिरपि, तद्यदा तावदेकवचनं तदा अव्ययीभावोऽनुप्रयुज्यते एकार्थस्यैकार्थे इति, यदा बहुवचनं तदा बहुव्रीहिरनुप्रयुज्यते बह्वर्थस्य बह्वर्थे इति

If so, both *avyayībhāva* and *bahuvrīhi* are enjoined between *avyaya* and *saṅkhyā* If the compound is singular, *avyayībhāva* form is used in *anuprayōga*, singular following singular and if the compound is plural, *bahuvrīhi* form is used in *anuprayōga*, plural following plural.

तत्पुरुषोऽनञ्कर्मधारयः (2, 4, 19)

किमर्थमिदमुच्यते? Why is this *sūtra* read?

संज्ञायां कन्थोशीनरेषु इति वक्ष्यति। तदतत्पुरुषस्य नञ्समासस्य कर्मधारयस्य वा मा भूदिति।

Ācārya is going to read *Saṁjñāyām kanthōśīnarēṣu* (2, 4, 20). This *sūtra* is read to prevent it from operating in *nañ-samāsa* and *karmadhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa*.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम्। न हि संज्ञायां कन्थान्तः उशीनरेषु अतत्पुरुषो नञ्समासः, कर्मधारयो वास्ति

This is not the benefit; for the word ending in *kanthā* of *uśīnaras* used as *saṁjñā* is neither *nañ-samāsa* nor *karmadhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa*.

उत्तरार्थं तर्हि। उपज्ञोपक्रमं तदाद्याचिख्यासायाम् इति वक्ष्यति, तद् अतत्पुरुषस्य नञ्समासस्य कर्मधारयस्य वा मा भूदिति।

For the sake of the next *sūtra* then. He is going to read *Upajñōpakramam tadādyācikhyāsāyām* (2, 4, 21). This is read to prevent it from operating in *nañsamāsa* and *karmadhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa*.

1. *Anuprayōgaḥ* = Associative word.

एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम् । न हि तदाद्याचिख्यासायामुपज्ञोपक्रमान्तोऽतत्पुरुषो नञ्समासः कर्मधारयो वास्ति

This, too, is not the benefit; for there is no word ending in *upajñā* or *upakrama* denoting beginning etc. which is a *nañ-samāsa* or *karmadhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa.*

उत्तरार्थमेव तर्हि । छाया बाहुल्ये इति वक्ष्यति, तदतत्पुरुषस्य नञ्समासस्य कर्मधारयस्य वा मा भूदिति ।

If so, it is for the sake of the next *sūtra*. He is going to read *Chāyā bāhulyē* (2, 4, 22). This is read so that it may not operate in *nañ samāsa* or *karmadhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa.*

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । न हि च्छायान्तो बाहुल्ये अतत्पुरुषो नञ्समासः कर्मधारयो वा अस्ति ।

This, too, is not the benefit; for there is no word ending with *chāyā* preceded by a word denoting an object in plenty which is *nañ-samāsa* or *karmadhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa*.

उत्तरार्थमेव तर्हि । सभा राजामनुष्यपूर्वा अशाला च इति वक्ष्यति । तदतत्पुरुषस्य नञ्समासस्य कर्मधारयस्य वा मा भूदिति ।

If so, it is for the sake of the next *sūtras*. He is going to read *Sabhā rājāmanuṣyapūrvā* (2, 4, 23), *Aśālā ca* (2, 4, 24). This is read so that they may not operate with reference to *nañ-samāsa* or *karmadhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa*.

एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम् । न हि सभान्तः अशालायाम् अतत्पुरुषो नञ्समासः कर्मधारयो वास्ति ।

This, too, is not the benefit; for there is no word ending in *sabhā* not referring to *saṅghāta* which is *nañsamāsa* or *karmadhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa.*

इदं तर्हि विभाषा सेनासुरेति वक्ष्यति, तदतत्पुरुषस्य नञ्समासस्य कर्मधारयस्य वा मा भूदिति ।

If so, he is going to read *vibhāṣā sēnāsurā* .... (2, 4, 25). This is read so that it may not operate with reference to *nañ-samāsa* or *karma-dhāraya* which is not *tatpuruṣa.*

तत्पुरुष इति किमर्थम् ? Why is *tatpuruṣaḥ* read ?

दृढसेनो राजा

So that this *sūtra* may not operate with reference to *Dṛḍhasēnō rājā*.

अनञिति किमर्थम्? Why is *anañ* read ?

असेना So that this *sūtra* may not operate in *asēnā*.

अकर्मधारय इति किमर्थम्? Why is *akarmadhārayaḥ* read ?

परमसेना, उत्तमसेना

So that this *sūtra* may not operate in *paramasēnā* and *uttamasēnā*.

परवल्लिङ्गं द्वन्द्वतत्पुरुषयोः (2, 4, 26)

किमर्थमिदमुच्यते? Why is this *sūtra* read ?

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* says that the question here is whether this *sūtra* enjoins the gender of *dvandva* and *tatpuruṣa samāsas* or of that which precedes them. The former is based upon taking *dvandva-tatpuruṣayōḥ* as the sixth case and the latter upon taking the same as the seventh case.

द्वन्द्वोऽयमुभयपदार्थप्रधानः । तत्र कदाचित् पूर्वपदस्य यल्लिङ्गं तत् समासस्यापि स्यात्, कदाचिद् उत्तरपदस्य ; इष्यते च परस्य यल्लिङ्गं तत् समासस्य यथा स्यादिति ; तच्चान्तरेण यत्नं न सिद्ध्यति इति परवल्लिङ्गं द्वन्द्वतत्पुरुषयोरिति । एवमर्थमिदमुच्यते

This *dvandva* is a coordinating compound. It may, sometimes, take the gender of the former member and sometimes that of the latter and it is desired that it should take the gender of the latter member. This cannot be achieved without effort and hence *Ācārya* reads this *sūtra* – *Paravalliṅgam dvandvatatpuruṣayōḥ*. This is the purpose served by the *sūtra*.

तत्पुरुषश्चापि कः प्रयोजयति ?

Which kind of *tatpuruṣa* makes use of this *sūtra* ?

यः पूर्वपदार्थप्रधान एकदेशिसमासः अर्धपिप्पली इति । यो ह्युत्तरपदार्थप्रधानः, दैवकृतं तस्य परवल्लिङ्गम् ।

The *ēkadēśisamāsa* of the type *ardhapippalī* where the former member is more prominent. Where the latter member is prominent it takes its gender without any effort.

परवल्लिङ्गं द्वन्द्वतत्पुरुषयोरिति चेत् प्राप्तापन्नालंपूर्वगतिसमासेषु प्रतिषेधः

Need for *pratiṣēdha* in compounds whose former member is *prāpta*, *āpannna* or *alam* and in *gatisamāsas*, if *paravalliṅgatva* of *dvandva* and *tatpuruṣa* is admitted.

परवाल्लिङ्गं द्वन्द्वतत्पुरुषयोरिति चेत् प्राप्तापन्नालंपूर्वगतिसमासेषु प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - प्राप्तो जीविकां प्राप्तजीविकः, आपन्नो जीविकाम् आपन्नजीविकः, अलं जीविकायै अलंजीविकः, निष्कौशाम्बिः निर्वाराणसिः ।

If it is enjoined that *dvandva* and *tatpuruṣa* take the *liṅga* of the latter, there is need to prohibit the same in the *samāsas* whose former member is *prāpta*, *āpanna* or *alam* and in *gatisamāsas*, as *prāptajīvikaḥ* (*prāptō jīvikām*), *āpanna-jīvikaḥ* (*āpannaḥ jīvikām*), *alaṁjīvikaḥ* (*alam jīvikāyāi*), *Niṣkāuśāmbiḥ* and *nirvārāṇasiḥ*.

पूर्वपदस्य च

Need of prohibiting the former member taking that of the latter too.

पूर्वपदस्य च प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः, मयूरीकुक्कुटौ

There is need to prohibit the former member, as in *Mayūrī-kukkuṭāu*, taking that of the latter.

NOTE :—This point arises on taking the word *dvandva-tatpuruṣayōḥ* as the seventh case. If so, there is chance for the former member to take the *liṅga* of the latter member since the *kāryin* is not read in the *sūtra* and the *samāsa* will take the form *mayūra-kukkuṭāu*.

यदि पुनर्यथाजातीयकं परस्य लिङ्गं तथाजातीयकं समासाद् अन्यद् अतिदिश्यते ।

Suppose the *liṅga* of the latter member which is other than *samāsaliṅga* is taken by *atidēśa*.

समासादन्यल्लिङ्गमिति चेदश्ववडवयोष्टाब्लुग्वचनम्

It it is conceded that the *liṅga* of the latter member other than *samāsaliṅga* is taken, there is need to enjoin the *lōpa* of *ṭāp* in *aśvavaḍavāu*.

समासाद् अन्यल्लिङ्गमिति चेद् अश्ववडवयोष्टापो लुग्वक्तव्यः, अश्ववडवौ ।

If it is conceded that the gender of the latter member other than *samāsaliṅga* is taken, there is need to enjoin the prohibition of *ṭāp* in *aśva* of the compound *aśvavaḍavāu*.

निपातनात्सिद्धम् It is secured from *nipātana*.

निपातनात्सिद्धमेतत् This is secured from *nipātana*.

किं निपातनम्? What is the *nipātana*?

अश्ववडवपूर्वापर .... इति *Aśvavaḍava-pūrvāpara* .... (1, 4, 27)

उपसर्जनह्रस्वत्वं वा Or there is shortening in the *upasarjana*.

अथ वा उपसर्जनस्येति ह्रस्वत्वं भविष्यति

Or *upasarjana* will be shortened by .. *upasarjanasya* (2, 2, 48).

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *avayavārtha* is subordinate to *samudāyārtha* and hence *upasarjana*.

इहापि तर्हि प्राप्नोति कुक्कुटमयूर्यौ इति

If so, shortening may appear in *kukkuṭamayūryāu* too

अस्तु Let it be.

परवल्लिङ्गमिति शब्दशब्दार्थौ

The word *liṅga* in *paravalliṅgam* refers to the *liṅgapratyaya* and its meaning.

परवल्लिङ्गमिति शब्दशब्दार्थौ अतिदिश्येते । तत्रौपदेशिकस्य ह्रस्वत्वम्, आतिदेशिकस्य श्रवणं भविष्यति ।

The word *liṅga* in *paravalliṅgam* is taken by *atidēśa* to refer to gender-suffix and its meaning. There will be shortening where it is enjoined and there will be no shortening where it is got by *atidēśa*.

NOTE :— *Kāiyaṭa* reads :- *Liṅgaśabdēna liṅgābhidhāyī pratyayō arthaś ca tantrēṇa ēkaśēṣēṇa vā ucyatē ityarthaḥ.*

इदं तर्हि - दत्ता च कारीषगन्ध्या च दत्ताकारीषगन्ध्ये, दत्ता च गार्ग्यायणी च दत्तागार्ग्यायण्यौ - द्वौ ष्यङौ द्वौ ष्फौ च प्राप्नुतः

If so, there is chance for two *ṣyaṅs* and two *ṣphas* in the words *Dattā-kārīṣagandhyē* and *Dattā-gārgyāyaṇyāu*, whose *vigrahavākya* is *Dattā ca kārīṣagandhyā ca* and *Dattā ca Gārgyāyaṇī ca.*

स्ताम् । पुंवद्भावेनैकस्य निवृत्तिर्भविष्यति

Let them be. One of them will be dropped thro' *puṁvadbhāva.*

इदं तर्हि दत्ता च युवतिश्च दत्तायुवती ; द्वौ तिशब्दौ प्राप्नुतः ।

If so, there is chance for two *ti's* in *Dattāyuvatī* whose *vigrahavākya* is *Dattā ca yuvatiś ca.*

तस्मान्नैतच्छक्यं वक्तुं शब्दशब्दार्थौ अतिदिश्येते इति ।

Hence it cannot be said that there is *atidēśa* for the *pratyaya* and its *artha.*

ननु चोक्तं समासादन्यालिङ्गमिति चेद्, अश्ववडवयोष्टाब्लुग्वचनम् इति

Oh it was raised that, if one other than the *samāsa* is conceded to take *paravalliṅga, lug* of *ṭāp* in *aśva-vaḍavāu* has to be enjoined.

परिहृतमेतत्, निपातनात् सिद्धम् इति

The objection was met by *Nipātanāt siddham.*

अथ वा नैवं विज्ञायते परस्यैव परवदिति

Or *paravad* is not taken in the sense of *parasya. ēva.*

कथं तर्हि ? In what sense is it taken then?

परस्येव परवद् इति । यथाजातीयकं परस्य लिङ्गं तथाजातीयकं समासस्यातिदिश्यते ।

It is taken in the sense of *parasya iva.* There is the *atidēśa* of that *liṅga* to the *samāsa* which is similar to that of the latter member.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *dvandva* is taken in three ways:- (1) *Dvandva* connotes only its component members which are interdependent. (2) It connotes a *samudāya* which is different from the component members, and it takes the gender of either of them, (3) It connotes a *samudāya* different from the component members whose gender is to be enjoined. With reference to (1) and (2), this *sūtra* is a *niyama-sūtra* and with reference to (3) It is a *vidhi-sūtra*. *Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* says that there is sanction in the *bhāṣya* for items (1) and (3) and it is doubtful whether there is sanction for item (2).

अथ पूर्वपदस्य न प्रतिषिध्यते

Then that of the former member is not prohibited.

प्राप्तादिषु कथम् ?

Which will sanction the *samāsa* whose former member is *prāpta* etc.

प्राप्तादिषु चैकदेशिग्रहणात् सिद्धम्

The object is achieved with reference to *prāptādis* by reading *ēkadēśin* in the *sūtra*.

द्वन्द्वैकदेशिनोः इति वक्ष्यामि I shall read *Dvandvāikadēśinōḥ*.

तदेकदेशिग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् *Dvandvāikadēśinōḥ* must be read then.

न कर्तव्यम् No, it need not be read.

एकदेशिसमासो नारभ्यते

Sūtras dealing with the *samāsa* of words with *ēkadēśivācaka-śabdas* are dropped.

NOTE:—The *sūtras* are *Pūrvāparādharōttaram ēkadēśināikādhikaraṇē* (2, 2, 1) *Ardham napuṁsakam* (2, 2, 2), and *Dvitīya* .... (2, 2, 3).

कथमर्धपिप्पली इति ?

How are we to arrive at the form *ardha-pippalī* ?

समानाधिकरणो भविष्यति - अर्द्धं च सा पिप्पली च अर्द्धपिप्पली इति

Samāsa takes place having both the members to be *samānādhikaraṇa* thus :- *Arddham ca sā pippalī ca arddhapippalī*.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* reads:—*Avayavē samudāyōpacārat sāmānādhikaraṇyam*.

न सिद्ध्यति, परत्वात् षष्ठीसमासः प्राप्नोति

No, it is not secured. *Ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa*, being *para*, will operate.

अत्र पुनरयमेकदेशिसमास आरभ्यमाणः षष्ठीसमासं बाधते

The injunction of *ēkadēśisamāsa* here vetoes *ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa*.

दृश्यते च षष्ठीसमासोऽपि । तद्यथा, अपूपार्द्धं मया भक्षितं, ग्रामार्द्धं मया लब्धम् इति । एवं पिप्पल्यर्द्धमित्यपि भवितव्यम् ।

Ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa too is desired. Like *apūpārddham* and *grāmārddham* in *Apūpārddham mayā bhakṣitam* and *Grāmārddham mayā labdham* will *pippalyarddham* be arrived at.

कथमर्द्धपिप्पली ? How is *arddhapippalī* secured ?

समानाधिकरणो भविष्यति

The two members will be taken to be in apposition.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *Mahābhāṣyakāra's* range of knowledge of Literature is wider than that of *Sūtrakāra* and *Vārttikakāra*, and hence his words carry greater weight.

रात्राह्नाहाः पुंसि (2, 4, 29)

अनुवाकादयः पुंसि

Need to enjoin that *anuvāka* etc. is masculine in gender.

अनुवाकादयः पुंसि भाष्यन्ते इति वक्तव्यम् - अनुवाकः, शंयुवाकः, सूक्तवाकः

It must be enjoined that *anuvāka* etc. are used in masculine gender. *Viz. Anuvākaḥ, śaṁyuvākaḥ* and *sūktavākaḥ*.

अपथं नपुंसकम् (2, 4, 30)

पुण्यसुदिनाभ्यामह्नो नपुंसकत्वम्

Ahan after the words *puṇya* and *sudina* to be neuter.

पुण्यसुदिनाभ्यामह्नो नपुंसकत्वं वक्तव्यम् - पुण्याहम्, सुदिनाहम् ।

It must be enjoined that *ahan* after *puṇya* and *sudina* is neuter. *Viz. Puṇyāham* and *sudināham*.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *sudina* means superiority.

पथः सङ्ख्याव्ययादेः

Patha to be neuter after words denoting number, *avyayas* etc.

पथः सङ्ख्याव्ययादेरिति वक्तव्यम् - द्विपथं, त्रिपथं, चतुष्पथम्, उत्पथं विपथम्

It must be enjoined that *patha* after words denoting number *avyayas*, etc. is neuter. *Viz. Dvipatham, tripatham, catuṣpatham, utpatham* and *vipatham*.

द्विगुश्च *Dvigu* too.

द्विगुश्च समासो नपुंसकलिङ्गो भवतीति वक्तव्यम्, पञ्चगवं, दशगवम् ।

It must be enjoined that *dvigusamāsa* is neuter in gender. *Viz. Pañcagavam* and *daśagavam.*

अकारान्तोत्तरपदो द्विगुः स्त्रियाम्

Dvigu whose latter member ends in *a* takes feminine suffix after it.

अकारान्तोत्तरपदो द्विगुः स्त्रियां भाष्यत इति वक्तव्यम् - पञ्चपूली, दशपूली

It must be enjoined that *dvigu* whose latter member ends in *a* takes feminine suffix after it. *Viz. Pañcapūlī* and *daśapūlī.*

वाबन्तः

Dvigu whose latter member ends in *ā* takes feminine suffix optionally.

वा आबन्तः स्त्रियां भाष्यत इति वक्तव्यम् - पञ्चखट्वी पञ्चखट्वं, दशखट्वी, दशखट्वम्

It must be enjoined that *dvigu* whose latter member ends in *ā* takes feminine suffix optionally. *Viz. Pañcakhaṭvī,* and *Pañcakhaṭvam ; daśakhaṭvī* and *daśakhaṭvam.*

अनो नलोपश्च The elision of *n* of *an* too.

अनो नलोपश्च, वा च स्त्रियां भाष्यत इति वक्तव्यम् - पञ्चतक्षं, पञ्चतक्षी, दशतक्षं दशतक्षी ।

It must be enjoined that *n* of *an* is dropped and it takes feminine suffix optionally. *Viz. Pañca-takṣam* and *pañca-takṣī ; daśa-takṣam* and *daśatakṣī.*

पात्रादिभ्यः प्रतिषेधः Prohibition with reference to *pātrādis.*

पात्रादिभ्यः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - पञ्चपात्रं, द्विपात्रम्

There is need to prohibit *pātrādis* *Viz. Pañcapātram* and *dvipātram.*

अर्द्धर्चाः पुंसि च (2, 4, 31)

अर्द्धर्चादयः *Arddharcādayaḥ* to replace *arddharcāḥ.*

अर्द्धर्चादय इति वक्तव्यम् - अर्द्धर्चम्, अर्द्धर्चः ; कार्षापणम्, कार्षापणः ; गोमयं, गोमयः ; सरकं, सरकः

Arddharcādayaḥ should replace *arddharcāḥ* to get the following forms :-*arddharcam* and *arddharcaḥ*: *kārṣāpaṇam* and *kārṣāpaṇaḥ* ; *gōmayam* and *gōmayaḥ* ; *sarakam* and *sarakaḥ*.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must be so read then.

न वक्तव्यम् No, it need not.

बहुवचननिर्देशात् सिद्धम्
It is secured by the plural suffix (in *arddharcāḥ*).

बहुवचननिर्देशाद् आद्यर्थो गम्यते
The meaning of *ādi* is suggested by the plural suffix.

इदमोऽन्वादेशेऽशनुदात्तस्तृतीयादौ (2, 4, 32)

Three topics are dealt with here:- (1) The interpretation of the expression *anvādēśa* (2) The need to read *ādēśa aś* (3) The need or otherwise of *śitkaraṇa* in *aś*.

I

अन्वादेशे समानाधिकरणग्रहणम्
Need to read *samānādhikaraṇam* with reference to *anvādēśa*.

अन्वादेशे समानाधिकरणग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्
Samānādhikaraṇam is to be read with reference to *anvādēśa*.

किं प्रयोजनम् ? Why ?

देवदत्तं भोजयेमं चेत्यप्रसङ्गार्थम्
To prevent *ēnam* in place of *imam* in *Dēvadattam bhōjaya, imam ca*.

इह मा भूत् - देवदत्तं भोजय इमं च यज्ञदत्तं भोजय इति ।
To prevent *ēnam* in place of *imam* in *Dēvadattam bhōjaya imam ca yajñadattam bhōjaya*.

अन्वादेशश्च कथितानुकथितमात्रम्
Anvādēśa means reference to that alone which has been previously read.

अन्वादेशश्च कथितानुकथितमात्रं द्रष्टव्यम् । तद् द्वैध्यं विजानीयाद् इदमा कथितमिदमैव यदानुकथ्यत इति । तदाचार्यः सुहृद् भूत्वा अन्वाचष्टे - अन्वादेशश्च कथितानुकथितमात्रम् इति

It must be taken that *anvādēśa* means *kathitānukathita* alone. It is not desired if one denoted by *idam* is referred to again by *idam*. Hence *Ācārya* (*Vārt'ikakāra*), being our friend, explains that *anvādēśa* means *kathitānukathita* (and not) *paścāt kathanam*).

II

अथ किमर्थमशादेशः क्रियते, न तृतीयादिषु इत्येवोच्येत । टायामोसि चैनेन भवितव्यम्, अन्याः सर्वा हलादयो विभक्तयः । तत्र इद्रूपलोपे कृते केवलमिदमोऽनुदात्तत्वमेव वक्तव्यम् ।

Why is the word *aś* read in the *sūtra*? It will do if *tṛtīyādāu* is read as *tṛtīyādiṣu*. When the case-suffixes *ṭāp* and *ōs* are used, let *ēna* be the *ādēśa* The other case-suffixes all commence in a consonant. When the form *id* is elided before them, it is necessary only to enjoin *anudāttatva*.

अत उत्तरं पठति The answer is hence read.

अशादेशवचनं साकच्कार्थम्
The reading of *aśādēśa* is for the sake of *akac*.

अशादेशवचनं साकच्कार्थं क्रियते । साकच्कस्यापि अयम् आदेशो यथा स्यात् - इमकाभ्यां छात्राभ्यां रात्रिरधीता अथो आभ्यामहरप्यधीतम् इति

Aśādēśa is read to allow the same for *idam* with *akac*. To allow *idam* with *akac* take the *ādēśa* as in *Imakābhyām chātrābhyām rātrir adhītā, athō ābhyām ahar apyadhītam*.

III

अथ किमर्थं शित्करणम्? Why is *a* read with *ś* as *it*?

शित्करणं सर्वादेशार्थम् *Śitkaraṇa* is to allow *sarvādēśa*.

शित्करणं क्रियते । सर्वादेशार्थम् - शित् सर्वस्य इति सर्वादेशो यथा स्यात् - इमकाभ्यां छात्राभ्यां रात्रिरधीता, अथो आभ्यामहरप्यधीतम् इति । अक्रियमाणे हि शित्करणे अलोऽन्त्यस्य विधयो भवन्तीति अन्त्यस्य प्रसज्येत ।

Śit is read. For the sake of *sarvādēśa*. To allow *sarvādēśa* by "... *śit sarvasya*" (1. 1. 55) and the word *ābhyām* can be used in the sentence *Imakābhyām chātrābhyām rātrir adhītā, athō*

ābhyām ahar apyadhītam. If *śit* is not read, the *ādēśa* will replace only the final syllable by *Alōntyasya* (1, 1. 52).

न चान्त्यस्य विकारवचनानर्थक्यात्
It need not be read on account of the *ānarthakya* of the *vikāravacana* to the final otherwise.

न वा वक्तव्यम् It need not be read.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

अन्त्यस्य विकारवचनानर्थक्यात् । अकारस्य अकारवचने प्रयोजनं नास्तीति कृत्वा अन्तरेणापि शकारं सर्वादेशो भविष्यति ।
Since the injunction of *ādēśa* to the final will prove unnecessary. *Sarvādēśa* will take place even without *śakāra*, since, otherwise, no purpose will be served by saying that *akāra* is replaced by *akāra*.

अर्थवत्त्वादेशप्रतिषेधार्थम्
On account of its having the purpose of preventing other *ādēśas* from appearing.

अर्थवत्तु अकारस्य अकारवचनम्
Injunction of *akāra* to replace *akara* has its own purpose.

कोऽर्थः ? What is the purpose ?

आदेशप्रतिषेधार्थम् । येऽन्ये अकारस्यादेशाः प्राप्नुवन्ति तद्बाधनार्थम् । तद्यथा मो राजि समः क्वौ इति मकारस्य मकारवचने प्रयोजनं नास्तीति कृत्वा अनुस्वारादयो बाध्यन्ते
To prohibit other *ādēśas* which have a chance to replace *akāra* from making their appearance. It has an analogy in the *sūtra Mō rāji samaḥ kvāu* which is taken to prohibit the *ādēśas* like *anusvāra* at the idea that no purpose is served by enjoining the *ādēśa m* to *m*.

तस्माच्छित्करणम् Hence is the need for *śitkaraṇa.*

तस्माच्छकारः कर्तव्यः Hence *ś* (as *it*) has to be read.

न कर्तव्यः । प्रश्लिष्टनिर्देशोऽयम् अ - अ इति । अनेकाल् शित् सर्वस्य इति सर्वादेशो भविष्यति ।

No, it need not be read. The two *a's* are read with a break between. Hence *sarvādēśa* takes place on the strength of the *sūtra Anēkāl śit sarvasya* (1, 1, 55).

अथ वा विचित्रास्तद्धितवृत्तयः । नान्वादेशेऽकजुत्पत्स्यते

Or wonderful is the nature of *taddhitavṛttis*. *Akac* may not appear with reference to *anvādēśa*.

एतदस्त्रतसोस्त्रतसौ चानुदात्तौ (2, 4, 33)

किमर्थं त्रतसोरनुदात्तत्वमुच्यते ?

Why is *anudāttatva* enjoined to *tral* and *tasl* ?

उदात्तौ मा भूतामिति So that they may not be *udātta*.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । लित्स्वरे कृते[1] निघाते एतदोऽनुदात्तत्वेन सिद्धम्

This is not the benefit. When the stem takes *udāttasvara* on account of its being followed by a suffix having *l* for the *it* (by the *sūtra Liti* 6, 1, 193) and consequently *tra* and *ta* become *anudātta*, the *ādēśa* of *ētad* becomes *anudātta* by this *sūtra*.

इदमिह सम्प्रधार्यम् - अनुदात्तत्वं क्रियतां, लित्स्वर इति

This is to be determined here whether *anudāttatva* of *aś* by the previous *sūtra* operates first or the *udāttatva* of the stem by the *sūtra Liti*.

किमत्र कर्तव्यम् ? What is to operate here ?

परत्वाल्लित्स्वरः

Svara by *Liti* (6, 1, 193), being *para*, operates first.

नित्यमनुदात्तत्वम् । कृतेऽपि लित्स्वरे प्राप्नोति, अकृतेऽपि

The *anudāttatva* is *nitya*. It appears whether *litsvara* has appeared or not.

तत्र नित्यत्वादनुदात्तत्वे कृते लिति पूर्वं उदात्तभावी नास्तीति कृत्वा यथाप्राप्त प्रत्ययस्वरः प्रसज्येत । तद्यथा गोप्यदघ्नं वृष्टो देवः इत्यूलोपे कृते पूर्वं उदात्तभावं नास्तीति कृत्वा यथाप्राप्तः प्रत्ययस्वरो भवति । तस्मात् त्रतसोरनुदात्तत्वं वक्तव्यम् ।

1. *Kṛtē* is omitted in Bombay edition.
2. *Etat* is another reading.

After *anudāttatra* of *aś*, being *nitya*, has set in, there is chance for the usual *pratyayasvara* (which is *udātta*) to set in, since there is no *udātta* stem to enable *tral* and *tasl* to become *anudātta*. In the word *gōṣpadapram* in the sentence *Gōṣpadapram vṛṣṭō dēvaḥ*, *ū* of *pūram* has been dropped and consequently *ra* has become *udātta*. Hence is the need to enjoin *anudāttatra* to *tra* and *tas* here.

द्वितीयाटौस्स्वेनः (2, 4, 34)

कस्यायमेनो विधीयते? To which is *ēnas* enjoined?

एतदः प्राप्नोति । इदमोऽपि त्विष्यते ।

It may be the *ādēśa* of *ētad*; but it is desired to be of *idam* also.

NOTE:—This arises by taking *ētadaḥ* here by *anuvṛtti* from the previous *sūtra*.

तदिदमो ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् If so, *idamaḥ* has to be read here.

न कर्तव्यम् । प्रकृतमनुवर्तते ।

No, it need not be read. It, being in this *prakaraṇa*, is taken here by *anuvṛtti*.

क्व प्रकृतम्? What is the *sūtra* referred to?

इदमोऽन्वादेशेऽशनुदात्तस्तृतीयादौ इति

The *sūtra Idamōsnvādēśēśś anudāttas tṛtīyādāu* (2, 4, 32).

यद्येवं तद् अनुवर्तते एतदस्त्रतसोस्त्रतसौ चानुदात्तौ इदमश्च इतीदमोऽपि प्राप्नोति ।

If it is taken by *anuvṛtti*, the *sūtra Etadas tratasōs tratasāu cānudāttāu* has to be read with *idamaś ca* at the end so that *idam* also will be replaced by *aś* before *tras* and *tasl*.

नैष दोषः । सम्बन्धमनुवर्तिष्यते । इदमोऽन्वादेशेऽशनुदात्तस्तृतीयादौ, एतदस्त्रतसोस्त्रतसौ चानुदात्तौ, इदमोऽन्वादेशेऽशनुदात्तस्तृतीयादावश् भवति । ततो द्वितीयाटौस्स्वेनः, इदमः एतदश्च, तृतीयादौ इति निवृत्तम् ।

This difficulty does not arise. There is *anuvṛtti* only to the connected element thus:—*Idamōsnvādēśēśś anudāttas tṛtīyādāu*, *Etadas tratasōs tratasāu cānudāttāu*. *Idamōsnvādēśēśś anudāttas*

tṛtīyādāvaś. Then the *sūtra Dvitīyāṭāussvēnaḥ Idamaḥ* and *ētadaḥ* are supplied here and the word *tṛtīyādāu* is allowed to recede.

अथ वा मण्डूकगतयोऽधिकाराः । तद्यथा - मण्डूका उत्प्लुत्योत्प्लुत्य गच्छन्ति तद्वदधिकाराः

Or *anuvṛttis* are like frog-leap. As frogs skip over intermediate things, so are *adhikāras.*

अथ वैकयोगः करिष्यते इदमोऽन्वादेशेशनुदात्तस्तृतीयादावेतदस्त्रतसोस्त्रतसौ चानुदात्तौ । ततो द्वितीयाटौस्स्वेनः, इदम एतदश्च तृतीयादाविति निवृत्तम्

Or the two *sūtras* are read as one thus:- *Idamō anvādēśēsś anudāttas tṛtīyādāu ētadas tratasōs tratasāu cānudāttāu.* Then is the *sūtra Dvitīyāṭāussvēnaḥ* read. *Idamaḥ* and *ētadaś ca* are taken here. *Tṛtīyādāu* recedes.

अथ वा उभयं निवृत्तं तदपेक्षिष्यामहे

Or both are not taken by *anuvṛtti,* but we take them by *adhyāhāra.*

एनदिति नपुंसकैकवचने Need to read *ēnad* in the neuter singular.

एनदिति नपुंसकैकवचने कर्तव्यम् । इदं कुण्डमानय, प्रक्षालय एनत्, परिवर्तयैनत्

There is need to read *ēnad* in the neuter singular to secure *ēnat* in *idam kuṇḍam ānaya. prakṣālaya ēnat ; parivartaya ēnat.*

यद्येनत् क्रियते एनो न वक्तव्यः

If *ēnat* is read, *ēnas* need not be enjoined.

का रूपसिद्धिः - अथो एनम्, अथो एने, अथो एनानि

How are the forms *athō ēnam, athō ēnē, athō ēnāni* to be got?

त्यदाद्यत्वेन सिद्धम्

It will be secured by the *atva* of *tyadādi* (by the *sūtra Tyadādīnām aḥ* (7, 2, 102).

यद्येवमेनश्रितको न सिध्यति, एनच्छ्रितक इति प्राप्नोति

If so, the form *ēnaśritakaḥ* cannot be secured and the form *ēnacchritakaḥ* will be secured.

यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते
Grammar has to decide the form of a word not current in the world.

आर्द्धधातुके (2, 4, 35)

जग्ध्यादिष्वार्द्धधातुकाश्रयत्वात्सति तस्मिन्विधानम्
Injunction of the *ādēśas* like *jagdhi* can take place only after the definite *ārddhadhātuka-pratyaya* makes its appearance, since they depend upon it.

जग्ध्यादिष्वार्द्धधातुकाश्रयत्वात् सति तस्मिन्नार्द्धधातुके जग्ध्यादिभिर्भवितव्यम्
The *ādēśas* like *jagdhi* will have to replace *sthānin* only after the particular *ārddhadhātuka-pratyaya* makes its appearance, since the appearance of the former depends upon that of the latter.

किमतो यत्सति भवितव्यम्
What is the harm if the *ādēśa* will have to set in only in the presence of the particular *ārddhadhātuka-pratyaya*?

तत्रोत्सर्गलक्षणप्रतिषेधः
Need, then, to prohibit the operation of the *sūtras* relating to *sthānin*.

तत्रोत्सर्गलक्षणं कार्यं प्राप्नोति, तस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः, भव्यं, प्रवेयम् आख्येयम् इति । ण्यत्यत्रस्थितेऽनिष्टे प्रत्यय आदेशः स्यात्; ण्यतः श्रवणं प्रसज्यते ।
There is chance, in that case, for the operation of the *sūtras* relating to *sthānin* and it must be prohibited. When the unwanted *ṇyat-pratyaya* has to follow *bhū*, *vī* and *khyā*, the vowel may take *vṛddhi* and the desired forms *bhavyam pravēyam* and *ākhyēyam* cannot be secured.

नैष दोषः This difficulty cannot arise.

सामान्याश्रयत्वाद्विशेषस्यानाश्रयः
The particular *pratyaya* is not taken into account on account of taking the *ārddhadhātukatva-jāti* into consideration.

सामान्ये ह्याश्रीयमाणे विशेषो नाश्रितो भवति । तत्र आर्द्धधातुकसामान्ये जग्ध्यादिष्वादेशेषु कृतेषु यो यतः प्रत्ययः प्राप्नोति स ततो भविष्यति ।

When the *ārddhadhātukajāti* is taken into account, the particular is not taken into consideration. After the *ādēśas jagdhi* etc. replace *sthānins* with the view that an *ārddhadhātuka* is after them, the particular *pratyaya* will take its place.

सामान्याश्रयत्वाद्विशेषस्यानाश्रय इति चेदुवर्णाकारान्तभ्यो ण्यद्विधिप्रसङ्गः

There is chance for *ṇyadvidhi* to *ukārānta* and *akārānta* if the principle *sāmānyāśrayatvād viśēṣasya anāśrayaḥ* is conceded.

सामान्याश्रयत्वाद् विशेषस्यानाश्रय इति चेद् उवर्णाकारान्तेभ्यो ण्यत् प्राप्नोति - लाव्यं, पाव्यम् इति - आर्द्धधातुकसामान्ये गुणे कृते, यि प्रत्ययसामान्ये च वान्तादेशे, हलन्तात् इति ण्यत् प्राप्नोति । इह च दित्स्यं, धित्सम्, आर्द्धधातुकसामान्येऽकारलोपे कृते हलन्तादिति ण्यत् प्राप्नोति ।

If the principle *sāmānyāśrayatvād viśēṣasya anāśrayaḥ* is conceded, there is chance for *ṇyat* with reference to *ukārānta* and *akārānta*. After *ū* of the roots *lū* and *pū* takes *guṇa* on account of being followed by *ārddhadhātukapratyaya*, it may take *vāntādēśa* since it is followed by *ya-jāti-pratyaya*. It may then take *ṇyat* by the *sūtra Ṛhalōr ṇyat* (3, 1, 124), since it ends in a consonant and consequently *lū* and *pū* cannot take the pratyaya *yat* after them to secure the forms *lavyam* and *pavyam*. Similarly *dā* and *dhā* will take *ṇyat* by the *sūtra Ṛhalōr ṇyat* after *ā* is elided on account of their being followed by *ārddhadhātuka-pratyaya* and not *yat* to secure the forms *ditsyam, dhitsyam*.

NOTE :—*Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* reads :-*Ditsyadhitsayōr yati* " *Yatōsnāva* ... " *iti ādyudāttatvam, ṇyati* " *Titsvaritam* " *iti svaritatvam iti bhēdaḥ.*

पौर्वापर्याभावाच्च सामान्येनानुपपत्तिः

Inappropriateness of taking the *jāti* on account of the absence of *paurvāparya*.

पौर्वापर्यभावाच्च सामान्येन जग्ध्यादीनामनुपपत्तिः । न हि सामान्येन पौर्वापर्यमस्ति

It is not possible for the *ādēśas jagdhi* etc. to make their appearance if we take the *jāti ārddhadhātukatva* into consideration, since it cannot be taken that it follows the *sthānin*.

NOTE :— *Kāiyaṭa* reads :- *Sāmānyasya vyāpakatvād nityatvācca dēśakālakṛtam pāurvāparyam nāsti.*

सिद्धं तु सार्वधातुके प्रतिषेधात्

The object is achieved by prohibiting the *ādēśa* when *sārvadhātuka* follows.

सिद्धमेतत् This (the object) is achieved.

कथम् ? How ?

अविशेषेण जग्ध्यादीनुक्त्वा सार्वधातुके न इति प्रतिषेधं वक्ष्यामि

Having said that the *jugdhi* etc. replace the *sthānin* whatever be the *pratyaya* which follows it, I shall state that it is prohibited when *sārvadhātukapratyaya* follows it.

सिध्यति । सूत्रं तर्हि भिद्यते

It is accomplished ; but the *sūtras* are modified.

यथान्यासमेवास्तु Let the *sūtras* remain as they are.

ननु चोक्तं जग्ध्यादिष्वार्द्धधातुकाश्रयत्वात् सति तस्मिन् विधानमिति

Oh, it was said *jagdhyādiṣu ārddhadhātukāśrayatvāt sati tasmin vidhānam*.

परिहृतमेतत् - सामान्याश्रयत्वाद् विशेषस्यानाश्रय इति

It was met by saying *Sāmānyāśrayatvād viśēṣasya anāśrayaḥ*.

ननु चोक्तं सामान्याश्रयत्वाद् विशेषस्यानाश्रय इति चेद् उवर्णाकारान्तेभ्यो ण्यद्विधिप्रसङ्गः इति

Oh it was raised *sāmānyāśrayatvād viśēṣasya anāśraya iti cēd uvarṇākārāntēbhyō ṇyadvidhiprasaṅguḥ*.

नैष दोषः ; वक्ष्यति तत्राज्ग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनम्, अजन्तभूतपूर्वमात्रादपि यथा स्याद् इति

This difficulty does not arise. He will say under the *sūtra* *Acō yat* (3, 1, 97) that the purpose of reading *acaḥ* in the *sūtra* is that the same may take place even in cases where *ac* was and has now been elided,

NOTE :—Here *vakṣyati* refers to *Mahābhāṣyakāra* himself.

यदप्युच्यते पौर्वापर्याभावाच्च सामान्येनानुपपत्तिरिति, अर्थसिद्धिरेवैषा यत् सामान्येन पौर्वापर्यं नास्ति । असति पौर्वापर्ये विषयसप्तमी विज्ञास्यते - आर्द्धधातुके विषये इति । तत्र आर्द्धधातुके विषये जग्ध्यादिषु कृतेषु यो यतः प्राप्नोति स ततो भविष्यति ।

With reference to the objection *Pāurvāparyābhāvācca sāmānyānupapattiḥ*, the object is achieved even though there is no *pāurvāparya* when *jāti* is taken into consideration by taking the *saptamī* to be *viṣayasaptamī*, so that *ārddhadhātukē* may be taken to mean when *ārddhadhātuka* is conceived in the mind. After the *ādēśas jagdhi* etc. have set in when the *ārddhadhātuka* is conceived in the mind, the particular *pratyaya* which is to come sets in.

अथवा आर्द्धधातुकासु इति वक्ष्यामि

Or *Ārddhadhātukāsu* will be read instead.

कासु आर्द्धधातुकासु ?

With reference to which *ārddhadhātukas?*

NOTE :—Here *ārddhadhātukāḥ* is taken to refer to the words *bhavya*, *lavya* which have *ārddhadhātukapratyayas* as their *avayava*. Hence *Kāiyaṭa* says that there is no harm even in *vyaktipakṣa*, since Grammar simply decides the correctness of words which already exist.

उक्तिषु युक्तिषु रूढिषु प्रतीतिषु श्रुतिषु संज्ञासु ।

With reference to words denoting their derivative meaning, and conventional meaning, to those formed only by grammatical rules, and current in the world and to those used as *saṁjñas*.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* reads here :- *Ārddhadhātukāsu saṁhatiṣu vyutpādyamānāsu astyādīnām bhvādaya ādēśā ityuktam bhavati.*

अदो जग्धिर्ल्यप्ति किति (2, 4, 36)

ल्यब्ग्रहणं किमर्थम् ? न 'ति किति' इत्येव सिद्धम् ?

Why is *lyap* read in the *sūtra*? Will it not do if the *sūtra* is read *Adō jagdhis ti kiti*?

ल्यपि कृते न प्राप्नोति

The *ādēśa jagdhiḥ* may not replace *at* before *lyap*.

इदमिह सम्प्रधार्यं, ल्यप् क्रियताम् आदेश इति

This has to be decided which of *lyap* and *ādēśa* should be given precedence.

किमत्र कर्तव्यम् ? Which should be done here ?

परत्वाल्ल्यप् *Lyap*, being *para*, should precede.

अन्तरङ्ग आदेशः The *ādēśa* is *antaraṅga*.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* reads :- *Antaraṅga ādēśa iti-Takārādi pratyayamātrāpēkṣatvāt ; lyab-ādēśas tu pūrvapadāpēkṣasamāsā-śrayatvād bahiraṅgaḥ.*

एवं तर्हि सिद्धे सति यल्ल्यब्ग्रहणं करोति तद् ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः अन्तरङ्गानपि विधीन् बहिरङ्गो ल्यब् बाधते इति

Since *Ācārya* reads *lyap* though the object is achieved otherwise, he suggests that *lyap*, though *bahiraṅga*, can veto *sūtras* which are *antaraṅga*.

किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनम् ?

What is gained from this suggestion ?

ल्यबादेश उपदेशिवद्वचनमनादिष्टार्थं बहिरङ्गलक्षणत्वात् इति वक्ष्यति, तन्न वक्तव्यं भवति

He (*Vārttikakāra*) is going to read (under 7, 1, 37) *Lyabādēśa upadēśivad-vacanam anādiṣṭārtham bahiraṅgalakṣaṇatvāt* and it is unnecessary.

NOTE :—1. *Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* reads :- *Upadēśivadvacanam iti upadēśī = ktvā, tadvad lyapō vacanam kāryam ityarthaḥ.*

NOTE :—2. *Kāiyaṭa* reads :- *Anādiṣṭārtham iti :-Pradhāy prasthāya ityādāu hitvādiṣu akṛtēṣvēva lyab yathā syād ityartha*

जग्धिविधिर्ल्यपि यत्तदकस्मात् सिद्धमदस् ति कितीति विधानात् ।

हिप्रभृतींस्तु सदा बहिरङ्गो ल्यब्भरतीति कृतं विद्धि ॥

Injunction of *jagdhi* before *lyap* is of no use. Its purpose served by reading *Ti kiti* alone. Hence learn that *lya* though *bahiraṅga* vetoes *hi* etc.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that the above verse was read b *Vyāghrabhūti.*

एप एवार्थः

जग्धौ सिद्धेऽन्तरङ्गत्वात्ति कितीति ल्यबुच्यते ।

ज्ञापयत्यन्तरङ्गाणां ल्यपा भवति बाधनम् ॥

The same is the meaning of the following verse :-

Jagdhāu siddhēsntaraṅgatvāt tikiti lyab ucyatē ।
Jñāpayatyantaraṅgāṇām lyapā bhavati bādhanam ॥

NOTE :—*Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* feels that the above verse perhap belongs to *Mahābhāṣyakāra* himself.

लुङ्सनोर्घस्लृ (2, 4, 37)

घस्लृभावेऽच्युपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to add that *ghasḷ* replaces *ad* before *ac-pratyaya.*

घस्लृभावेऽच्युपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम - प्रात्तीति प्रघसः

It must be added that *ghas* replaces *ad* before *ac-pratyaya* t secure the form *praghasaḥ* (*pra atti iti*).

हनो वध लिङि (2, 4, 42) ; लुङि च (2, 4, 43)

किमयं वधिर्व्यञ्जनान्तः, आहोस्विद् अदन्तः !

Does the root in *vadha* end in consonant or vowel ? (i. e. Is the final *akāra* in *vadha* a part of the root or used t facilitate pronunciation ?

किं चातः ! What does it matter if it is either ?

यदि व्यञ्जनान्तः If it ends in the consonant,

वधौ व्यञ्जनान्त उक्तम् [1]

If *vadha* is *vyañjanānta*, the defect was pointed out.

किमुक्तम्? What was it?

वध्यादेशे वृद्धितत्वप्रतिषेध इड्विधिश्च इति

Vadhyādēśē vṛddhitatvapratiṣēdha iḍvidhiś ca (1, 1, 56) [2]

अथ अदन्तः, न दोषो भवति

If it is taken to end in *a*, there will be no defect.

यथा न दोषस्तथास्तु Let it be such as is unquestionable.

इणो गा लुङि (2, 4, 45)

इण्वदिकः To *ik* like *iṇ*.

इण्वदिक इति वक्तव्यम् - इहापि यथा स्यात्, अध्यगात्, अध्यगाताम्, अध्यगुः

It must be said that the *ādēśa* replaces *ik* like *iṇ*, to secure the forms *adhyagāt*, *adhyagātām* and *adhyaguḥ*.

णौ गमिरबोधने (2, 4, 46)

इण्वदिक इत्येव - अधिगमयति, अधिगमयतः, अधिगमयन्ति ।

Here too it must be said that the *ādēśa* replaces *ik* like *iṇ* to secure *adhigamayati*, *adhigamayataḥ* and *adhigamayanti*.

सनि च (2, 4, 47)

इण्वदिक इत्येव - अधिजिगमिषति, अधिजिगमिषतः, अधिजिगमिषन्ति ।

Here too it must be said that the *ādēśa* replaces *ik* like *iṇ* to secure *adhijigamiṣati*, *adhijigamiṣataḥ* and *adhijigamiṣanti*.

गाङ्लिटि (2, 4, 49)

ङित्करणं किमर्थम्? Why is *gāṅ* read as *ṅit*?

1. This may be taken as *bhāṣya*.
2. *Cf.* Vol. III pp. 105, 106.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that, since the *sthānin* (*iṅ*) is
this is unnecessary.

गाङ्यनुबन्धकरणं विशेषणार्थम्

Reading *ṅ* as *it* in *gāṅ* is for restriction.

गाङि अनुबन्धकरणं क्रियते, विशेषणार्थम्

Ṅ is read as *it* in *gāṅ* to restrict the application.

क्व विशेषणार्थेनार्थः? Where is *viśēṣaṇa* useful?

गाङ्कुटादिभ्योऽञ्णिन्ङिद् इति In *gāṅ* of *Gāṅkuṭādibhyōsñṇi-n-*

गाकुटादिभ्योऽञ्णिन्ङिद् इतीयत्युच्यमाने इणादेशस्यापि प्रसज्येत ।

If the *sūtra* is read *Gākuṭādibhyōsñ ṇin ṅit*, it will operate relation to the *ādēśa* of *iṇ* also.

ज्ञापकं वा सानुबन्धकस्यादेशवचन इत्कार्याभावस्य

Or reading the *ādēśa* with *anubandha* suggests the abse therein of the *itkārya* of the *sthānin*.

अथ वैतद् ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः, सानुबन्धकस्यादेशे इत्कार्यं न भवतीति

Or *Ācārya* (*Sūtrakāra*) suggests that the reading of *anuban* in *ādēśa* prevents it from taking the *itkārya* of the *sthānin*.

किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनम्? What is the benefit of this *jñāpa*

प्रयोजनं चक्षिङः ख्याञ्

Benefit is seen in *khyāñ*, the *ādēśa* of *cakṣiṅ*.

चक्षिङः ख्याञ् प्रयोजनम् - चख्यौ, ख्यास्यति इति; ङितः इत्यात्मने नित्यं न भवति

Benefit is seen with reference to the *ādēśa khyāñ* of *cakṣiṅ*, the forms *cakhyāu*, and *khyāsyati*, which show t *ātmanēpada* terminations by the *sūtra Anudāttaṅita ātma padam* (1, 3, 12) are not *nitya* there.

लटः शतृशानचौ

Benefit is with reference to *śānac*, the *ādēśa* of *laṭ* mention in the *sūtra Laṭaḥ* ... (3, 2, 124).

लटः शतृशानचो प्रयोजनं, पचमानः यजमानः इति, टितः इत्येत्वं न भवति ।
Benefit is seen with reference to *śānac*, the *ādēśa* of *laṭ* read in the *sūtra Laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāu* .... (3, 2 124) in the forms *pacamānaḥ* and *yajamānaḥ* where *ētva* by *Ṭita ātmanēpadānām ṭērē* (3, 4, 79) is absent.

युवोरनाकौ

Benefit is with reference to the *ādēśas* of *ana* and *aka* of *yu* and *vu* respectively.

युवोरनाकौ च प्रयोजनम् - नन्दनः, कारकः, नन्दना, कारिका इति उगिल्लक्षणौ ङीब्नुमौ न भवतः ।

Benefit is seen with reference to *ana* and *aka*, the *ādēśas* of *yu* and *vu* read in *Yuvōr anākāu* (7, 1, 1) in the forms *nandanā* and *kārikā* derived from *nandana* and *kāraka* where *ṅīp* and *num* appearing after *ugit* are absent.

मेश्चाननुबन्धकस्याम्वचनम्

Need to read *am* as the *ādēśa* of *mi* without the *anubandha p* in the *sūtra Tas-thas-tha-mipām tāntantāmaḥ* (3, 4, 101).

मेश्च अननुबन्धकस्याम् वक्तव्यः, अचिनवम्, अकरवम्, असुनवम् ।

It is necessary to state that *mi* and not *mip* takes *ādēśa am* to secure the forms *acinavam*, *akaravam* and *asunavam*.

NOTE :—Hence *u* of *nu* takes *guṇa*, the *pitkārya*, in *acinavam* etc.

अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते, मेरिति । तिप्सिम्मिपामिति वक्तव्यम्, इहापि यथ स्यात् वेद, वेत्थ

Reading of *mēḥ* alone is very meagre; it should have been read *tip-sim-mipām*, to have *guṇa* in the forms *vēda* and *vēttha* also.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* feels that this amendment of *mēḥ* is unnecessary, while *Nāgēśabhaṭṭa* feels it necessary.

अस्य ज्ञापकस्य सन्ति दोषाः; सन्ति प्रयोजनानि; समा दोषा भूयांसो वा; तस्मान्नार्थोऽनेन ज्ञापकेन ।

There are defects in the *jñāpaka* aud there are merits; the defects are the same in number as the merits or greater and hence the *jñāpaka* need not be resorted to.

कथं यानि प्रयोजनानि ? What about the merits?

नैतानि सन्ति; इह तावत् चक्षिङः ख्याञ् इति, ञित्करणसामर्थ्याद्विभाषा आत्मनेपदं भविष्यति; लटः शतृशानचौ इति, वक्ष्यत्येतत् प्रकृतानामात्मनेपदानां टेरेत्वं भवति इति; युवोरनाकौ इति, वक्ष्यत्येतत्, सिद्धं तु युवोरनुनासिकत्वाद् इति।
The merits do not exist. Firstly with reference to *Cakṣiṅaḥ khyāñ*, *ātmanēpada* sets in optionally on the strength of *ñitkaraṇa;* with reference to *Laṭaḥ śātṛśānacāu*, he (*Mahābhāṣyakāra*) is going to state (under 3, 4, 79) that *ētva* replaces *ṭi* only before the *ātmanēpada* terminations read in the *sūtra Tip-tas-jhi* ...; and with reference to *Yuvōr anākāu* he (*Vārttikakāra*) is going to say (under 7, 1, 1) that *yu* and *vu* followed by *anunāsika* alone are taken into account.

NOTE:—The reading *anunāsikaparatvāt* is found under the *sūtra Yuvōr anākāu* (7, 1, 1).

चाक्षिङः ख्याञ् (2, 4, 54)

किमयं क्शादिः,[1] आहोस्वित् ख्यादिः?
Does this commence with *kś* or *khy*?

चाक्षिङः क्शाञ्ख्याञौ
The *sūtra* is to be read thus *Cakṣiṅaḥ kśāñkhyāñāu.*

चक्षिङः क्शाञ्ख्याञिति[2] क्शादिश्च ख्यादिश्च
It commences with *kś* and *khy*, since the *sūtra* is to be read *Cakṣiṅaḥ kśāñkhyañāu.*

ख्शादिर्वा Or it commences with *khś.*

अथ वा ख्शादिर्भविष्यति Or it may commence with *khś.*

1. *Kaśādiḥ* is another reading.
2. It seems the reading *kśāñ-khyāñāviti* is better.

केनेदानीं क्शादिर्भविष्यति ?

How will the initial element become *kś*?

चर्त्वेन By *cartva*.

अथ ख्यादिः कथम् ?

How will the initial element become *khy*?

असिद्धे शस्य यवचनं विभाषा

Need to read *śasya yatvam vibhāṣā* after the *sūtra Pūrvattrāsiddham*.

असिद्धे शस्य विभाषा यत्वं वक्तव्यम्

Śasya vibhāṣā yatvam must be read after *Pūrvattrāsiddham.*

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why?

प्रयोजनं सौप्रख्येऽवुञ्विधिः

Vuñvidhi does not operate with reference to *sāuprakhya*.

सौप्रख्य इति योपधलक्षणो वुञ्विधिर्न भवति । सौप्रख्यार्थे इति वृद्धाच्छ इति छो भवति

The *sūtra Yōpadhād gurūpōttamād vuñ* (5, 1, 132) does not operate with reference to *sāuprakhya*. *Chaḥ* sets in there by the *sūtra Vṛddhāc chaḥ* (4, 2, 114).

निष्ठानत्वमाख्याते *Na* does not replace *kta* in the word *ākhyāta*.

आख्यात इति निष्ठानत्वं न भवति

Na does not replace *kta* in the word *ākhyāta*.

रुविधिः पुंख्याने *Rutva* does not appear in *puṁkhyāna*.

पुंख्यानमिति रुविधिर्न भवति

The *sūtra Pumaḥ khayyamparē* (8, 3, 6) does not operate in *puṁkhyānam*.

णत्वं पर्याख्याने Absence of *ṇatva* in the word *paryākhyāna*.

पर्याख्यानमिति णत्वं न भवति

Ṇatva does not appear (by the *sūtra Kṛtyacaḥ* 8, 4, 29) in *paryākhyāna*.

सस्थानत्वं नमः ख्यात्रे
Jihvāmūlīya does not replace *visarga* in *namaḥ khyātrē.*

नमः ख्यात्र इति सस्थानत्वं न भवति

Jihvāmūlīya does not replace *visarga* in *namaḥ khyātrē.*

NOTE:—*Sasthānatva* is the *pūrvācārya-saṁjñā* for *Jihvāmūlīya.*

वर्जने प्रतिषेधः Prohibition of the *ādēśa* in the meaning of *varjana*

वर्जने प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः, अवसंचक्ष्याः, परिसंचक्ष्याः

Need to prohibit the *ādēśa* in the sense of *varjana* to secure the forms *avasaṁcakṣyāḥ* and *parisaṁcakṣyāḥ.*

असनयोश्च Prohibition before the *pratyayas a* and *san* too.

असनयोश्च प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः, नृचक्षा रक्षः, विचक्षण इति ।

There is to prohibit the *ādēśa* before the *pratyayas a* and *san* to secure the forms *nṛcakṣā rakṣaḥ, vicakṣaṇaḥ.*

बहुलं तणि Need to read *Bahulam taṇi.*

बहुलं तणीति वक्तव्यम् *Bahulam taṇi* is to be read.

किमिदं तणीति ? What is meant by *taṇi* ?

संज्ञाच्छन्दसोर्ग्रहणम् *Saṁjñā* and *chandas.*

किं पयोजनम् ? What is the benefit ?

अन्नवधकगात्रविचक्षणाजिराद्यर्थम्
To secure the forms *anna, vadhaka, gātra, vicakṣaṇa, ajira* etc.

अन्न - अन्नम्, वधक - वधकम्, गात्र - गात्रं पश्य, विचक्षण - विचक्षणः, आजिर - अजिरे तिष्ठति

So that the forms *annam, vadhakam, gātram* in *gātram paśya, vicakṣaṇaḥ* and *ajiram* in *ajirē tiṣṭhati* may be secured.

अजेर्व्यघञपोः (2, 4, 56)

घञपोः प्रतिषेधे क्यप उपसङ्ख्यानम् Need to add *kyap* to *agañ-apōḥ.*

घञपोः प्रतिषेधे क्यप उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् । इहापि यथा स्यात् - समजनं, समज्य इति ।

There is need to add *kyap* to *ghañ* and *ap* in the *pratiṣēdha*, so that it may operate here too in *samajanam* and *samajya*.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be read.

न वक्तव्यम्, अपीत्येव भविष्यति

No, it need not be read. It is secured from *api*.

NOTE :—*Ghañapōḥ* means *ghañi* and *api parē*.

कथम् ? How?

अपीति नेदं प्रत्ययग्रहणम्

Ap in *api* does not refer to the *pratyaya*.

किं तर्हि ? To what then ?

प्रत्याहारग्रहणम् It refers to the *pratyāhāra*.

क सन्निविष्टानां प्रत्याहारः ?

From which is the *pratyāhāra* formed ?

अपोऽकारात्प्रभृति आ क्यपः पकारात्

From *a* of *ap* (in the *sūtra* *Ṛdōr ap* 3, 3, 57) to *p* in *kyap* (in the *sūtra* *Vraja-yajōr bhāvē kyap* 3, 3, 97).

यदि प्रत्याहारग्रहणं संवीतिर्न सिध्यति

If it is taken as *pratyāhāra*, the form *saṁvītiḥ* is not secured.

NOTE :—*Saṁvītiḥ* is secured from *Striyām ktin* (3, 3, 94) and *ktin* comes under the *pratyāhāra ap*

एवं तर्हि नार्थ उपसङ्ख्यानेन, नापि घञपोः प्रतिषेधेन । इदमस्ति चक्षिङः ख्याञ्, वा लिटि इति; ततो वक्ष्यामि' अजेर्वी - अजेर्वीभावो भवति वा, व्यवस्थितविभाषा च वा इति, तेनेह च भविष्यति प्रवेता, प्रवेतुं, प्रवीतो रथः, संवीतिरिति ; इह च न भविष्यति - समाजः समजः, उदाजः उदजः, समजनम् उदजनं, समज्य इति ।

If so, no purpose is served by *upasaṅkhyāna* or by the *pratiṣēdha* of *ghañ* and *ap*. There are here the *sūtras Cakṣiṅaḥ*

khyāñ and *Vā liṭi* (2, 4, 55). Then shall I read *Ajēr vī*, which may mean that *vī* optionally replaces *aj* (by taking here *vā* from the previous *sūtra*) and take it to be *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā*, so that it operates with reference to *pravētā*, *pravētum*, *pravītō rathaḥ*, and *saṁvītiḥ* and does not operate with reference to *samājaḥ*, *samajaḥ*, *udājaḥ*, *udajaḥ*, *samajanam*, *udajanam*, and *samajya*.

तत्रायमप्यर्थः, इदमपि सिद्धं भवति प्राजिता इति

In that case this too—*prājitā* is secured.

किं च भो इष्यते एतद्रूपम् ? Oh*!* Sir, is that form wished for?

बाढमिष्यते Certainly, it is desired.

एवं हि कश्चिद् वैयाकरण आह, कोऽस्य रथस्य प्रवेता इति

A grammarian says thus, "Who is the *pravētā* (charioteer) of this chariot?"

सूत आह, आयुष्मन्नहम् अस्य रथस्य प्राजिता इति

The charioteer replies, "Sir, I am the *prājitā* of this chariot."

वैयाकरण आह, अपशब्द इति

The grammarian says, "It is incorrect form."

सूत आह, प्राप्तिज्ञो देवानांप्रियः, न त्विष्टिज्ञः, इष्यत एतद्रूपम् इति ।

The charioteer replies, "Sir, you, a learned fool, know only the forms learnt from *sūtras* and do not know the forms secured from *iṣṭi*[1] (the opinion of the *Mahābhāṣyakāra*) and this form - *prājitā* - is recognised by him."

वैयाकरण आह, अहो नु खल्वनेन दुरुतेन बाध्यामहे इति

The grammarian says, "Oh, we are so slighted by this *duruta*."

सूत आह, न खलु वेञः सूतः, सुवतेरेव सूतः । यदि सुवतेः कुत्सा प्रयोक्तव्या, दुःसूतेनेति वक्तव्यम्

1. It is worthy of consideration whether *Mahābhāṣyakāra* himself calls his views as *iṣṭi*.

The charioteer replies, "The word *Sūtaḥ* is not derived from the root *vī*, but from the root *sū*." If you want to derive a term of contempt from *sū*, it should be *duḥsūtēna*."

न तर्हीदानीमिदं वा यौ इति वक्तव्यम्

In that case the *sūtra Vā yāu* (2, 4, 57) need not be read.

वक्तव्यं च It has to be read.

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why?

नेयं विभाषा This (*vā*) does not denote *vibhāṣā*.

किं तर्हि? What then?

आदेशोऽयं विधीयते । वेत्ययमादेशो भवत्यजेर्यौ परतः, वायुरिति

This is enjoined as an *ādēśa*. Hence the *sūtra* means that the root *aj* takes the *ādēśa vā* when it is followed by *yu* to secure the from *vāyuḥ*.

ण्यक्षत्रियार्षञितो यूनि लुगणिञोः (2, 4, 58)

अणिञोर्लुकि तद्राजाद्युवप्रत्ययस्योपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to add *yuvapratyaya* after *tadrāja* with reference to the *luk* of *aṇ* and *iñ*.

अणिञोर्लुकि तद्राजाद्युवप्रत्ययस्योपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - बौधिः पिता, बौधिः पुत्रः; औदुम्बरिः पिता, औदुम्बरिः पुत्रः ।

There is need to add *yuvapratyaya* after *tadrāja* with reference to the *luk* of *aṇ* and *iñ*. *Viz. Bāudhiḥ* (father), *Bāudhiḥ* (son); *Āudumbariḥ* (father). *Āudumbariḥ* (son).

अपर आह Another says.

अणिञोर्लुकि क्षत्रियगोत्रमात्राद्युवप्रत्ययस्योपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to add *yuvapratyaya* after *kṣatriyagōtra* alone with reference to the *luk* of *aṇ* and *iñ*.

अणिञोर्लुकि क्षत्रियगोत्रमात्राद्युवप्रत्ययस्योपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यमिति । जाबालिः पिता, जाबालिः पुत्रः

There is need to add *yavapratyaya* after *Kṣatriyagōtra* alone with reference to the *luk* of *aṇ* and *iñ*. *Viz Jābāliḥ* (father), *Jābāliḥ* (son).

अपर आह Another says

अब्राह्मणगोत्रमात्राद्युवप्रत्ययस्योपसङ्ख्यानम्

Need to add *yuvapratyaya* after *abrāhmaṇagōtra* alone.

अब्राह्मणगोत्रमात्राद्युवप्रत्ययस्योपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यमिति

There is need to add *yuvapratyaya* after *abrāhmaṇagōtra* alone.

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why

इदमपि सिद्धं भवति, भाण्डिजङ्घिः पिता, भाण्डिजङ्घिः पुत्रः, कार्णखरकिः पिता, कार्णखरकिः पुत्रः

The following forms also can be secured. *Viz. Bhāṇḍijaṅghiḥ* (father), *Bhāṇḍijaṅghiḥ* (son); *Kārṇakharakiḥ* (father), *Kārṇakharakiḥ* (son).

Āhnika - Twentyseven ends.

(Second *Adhyāya* fourth *pāda* first *āhnika*) ends.

Āhnika - Twenty eight

(Second *Adhyāya*, fourth *pāda*, second *āhnika*)

तद्राजस्य बहुषु तेनैवास्त्रियाम् (2, 4, 62)

Whether the stem of *bahuṣu* denotes *bahuvacanapratyaya* or *bahuvacanapratyayārtha* is the only topic that is discussed here.

तद्राजादीनां लुकि समासबहुत्वे प्रतिषेधः

Need to probibit the *luk* of *tadrājādis* with reference to *samāsabahutva*.

तद्राजादीनां लुकि समासबहुत्वे प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - प्रिय आङ्ग एषां त इमे प्रियाङ्गाः, प्रियो वाङ्ग एषां ते इमे प्रियवाङ्गा इति

There is need to prohibit the *luk* of *tadrājādis* when the plural number in compound is taken into account, as in *priyāṅgāḥ* (*priyaḥ āṅgaḥ ēṣām tē*) and *priyavāṅgāḥ* (*priyaḥ vāṅgaḥ ēṣām tē*).

किमुच्यते समासबहुत्वे प्रतिषेध इति, यदा तेनैव चेत्कृतं बहुत्वम् इत्युच्यते, न चात्र तेनैव कृतं बहुत्वम् ?

Why is it said that there is need for the *pratiṣēdha* with reference to *samāsabahutva*, since the *sūtra* enjoins *luk* only when *bahutva* is concerned with *tadrājānta* and it is not found here?

भवति वै किञ्चित् - आचार्याः क्रियमाणमपि चोदयन्ति तद्वा कर्तव्यं, तेनैव चेद् बहुत्वमिति, समासबहुत्वे वा प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्य इति

It sometimes happens that *Ācāryas*, doing one thing, suggest another. The *vārttika* suggests that either the word *tēnaiva* is to be read in the *sūtra* or it (the *vārttika Tadrājādīnām luki samāsabahutvē pratiṣēdhaḥ*) is to be read.

अबहुत्वे लुग्वचनम्

Need to enjoin *luk* when *samāsa* has no plural suffix.

अबहुत्वे च लुग् वक्तव्यः - अतिक्रान्तोऽङ्गान् अत्यङ्ग इति

There is need to enjoin *luk* when *samāsa* does not have plural suffix after it as in *atyaṅga*.

बहुवचने परतो यस्तद्राज इत्येवं च कृत्वा चोद्यते । अथ किमर्थं पुनरिदं ? न बहुवचन इत्येव सिद्धम् ?

The discussion rests on the assumption that the *tadrājānta* is followed by plural suffix. In that case, what is the need for this *vārttika*? Is not its purpose served by the *bahuvacana-pratyaya* ?

न सिध्यति ; बहुवचन इत्युच्यते, न चात्र बहुवचनं पश्यामः

No, it is not served ; *bahuvacana* is stated there and we do not find *bahuvacana* here.

प्रत्ययलक्षणेन भविष्यति

It is taken to exist by *Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam* (1, 1, 62)

न लुमता तस्मिन् इति प्रत्ययलक्षणस्य प्रतिषेधः

There is *pratiṣēdha* for *pratyayalakṣaṇa* from the principle *Na lumatā tasmin.*

NOTE :—*Na lumatā tasmin* is a *vārttika* found under the *sūtra Na lumatāṅgasya* (1, 1, 62).

न लुमताङ्गस्येति वक्ष्यामि

The *sūtra* '*Na lumatāṅgasya*', shall I explain to give that meaning,

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* takes the *kārya*, whether it is enjoined in *aṅgādhikāra* or elsewhere, to the *aṅga* when the *pratyaya* after it is dropped by stating the expressions *luk* etc. *Luk* here is the *kārya* of the *pratyaya* and not *samastāṅga*.

नैवं शक्यम् । इह हि दोषः स्यात् – पञ्चभिर्गार्गीभिः क्रीतः पटः पञ्चगार्ग्यः, दशगार्ग्य इति

Such an interpretation is not possible. For there will be difficulty here in the word *pañcagārgyaḥ* whose *vigrahavākya* is *pañcabhir gārgībhiḥ krītaḥ* and in the word *daśagārgyaḥ*.

द्वन्द्वेऽबहुषु लुग्वचनम्

Need to enjoin *luk* in *dvandva* whose component members are not followed by plural suffix.

द्वन्द्वेऽबहुषु लुग् वक्तव्यः, गर्गवत्सवाजा इति

There is need to enjoin *luk* in *dvandva* whose component members are not followed by plural suffix. *Viz. Gargavatsavājāḥ.*

इह च लुग् वक्तव्यः - गर्गेभ्य आगतं गर्गरूप्यं, गर्गमयम् इति

There is need to enjoin *luk* here too, in the words *gargarūpyam* and *gargamayam* whose derivation is *Gargēbhya āgatam.*

NOTE :—*Gargarūpyam* is secured from the *sūtra Hētumanuṣyēbhyōsnyatarasyām rūpyaḥ* (4, 3, 81) and *gargamayam* from the *sūtra Mayaṭ ca* (4, 3, 82).

इह च अत्रय इति उदात्तनिवृत्तिस्वरः प्राप्नोति

The *anudātta* (*jas*) following the *udātta* (*ḍhak*) which is dropped in *atrayaḥ* will become *udātta*.

सिद्धं तु प्रत्ययार्थबहुत्वे लुग्वचनात्

The object is then achieved if it is conceded that there is *luk* for *tadrājānta* when the meaning of the plural suffix is taken into consideration.

सिद्धमेतत् This (the object) is achieved.

कथम्? How?

प्रत्ययार्थबहुत्वे लुग्वक्तव्यः

There is need to enjoin *luk* if plurality is taken into consideration.

यदि प्रत्ययार्थबहुत्वे लुगुच्यते तेनापि अस्त्रियामिति वक्तव्यम् । इह मा भूत् आङ्ग्यः स्त्रियः, वाङ्ग्यः स्त्रिय इति । यस्य पुनर्बहुवचने परतो लुगुच्यते तस्य ईकारेण व्यवहितत्वान्न भविष्यति ।

If it is conceded that there is *luk* if *bahuvacanapratyayārtha* follows, there is the necessity to read *astriyām* in the *sūtra* to prevent *luk* in *Āṅgyaḥ (striyaḥ)* and *Vāṅgyaḥ (striyaḥ.)*

But if it is taken that there is *luk* when *bahuvacanapratyaya* follows, *astriyām* need not be read, since *īkāra* intercedes between *tadrājānta* and plural suffix.

यस्यापि तु बहुवचने परतो लुगुच्यते, तेनापि अस्त्रियाम् इति वक्तव्यम् - आम्बष्ठ्याः स्त्रियः सौवीर्याः स्त्रियः इत्येवमर्थम् ।

There is need to read *astriyām* in the *sūtra* even by him who holds the view that there is *luk* when the plural suffix follows, to secure the forms *āmbaṣṭhyāḥ* (*striyaḥ*), and *Sāuvīryāḥ* (*striyaḥ*).

अत्रापि चापा व्यवधानम् Here too there is interception by *āp*.

एकादेशे कृते नास्ति व्यवधानम्

There is no interception after *ēkādēśa* is effected.

एकादेशः पूर्वविधौ स्थानिवद्भवतीति स्थानिवद्भावाद् व्यवधानमेव ।

There is interception through *sthānivadbhāva* from the dictum *Ekādēśaḥ pūrvavidhāu sthānivad bhavati.*

द्वन्द्वेऽबहुषु लुग्वचनम्

Need to enjoin *luk* in *dvandva* whose component members are not concerned with the meaning of plural suffix.

द्वन्द्वेऽबहुषु लुग्वक्तव्यः, गर्गवत्सवाजा इति

Luk is to be enjoined in *dvandva* whose component members have no concern with the meaning of plural suffix.

गोत्रस्य बहुषु लोपिनो बहुवचनान्तस्य प्रवृत्तौ द्व्येकयोरलुक्

Need to enjoin *aluk* to *tadrāja* followed by *bahvarthatva* when they are followed by *gōtrapratyaya* followed by the singular, or the dual, case-suffix.

गोत्रस्य बहुषु लोपिनो बहुवचनान्तस्य प्रवृत्तौ द्व्येकयोरलुग् वक्तव्यः । बिदानामपत्यं माणवको बैदः, बैदौ ।

There is need to enjoin *aluk* to *tadrāja* followed by *bahvarthatva* when they are followed by *apatyapratyaya* followed by the singular, or the dual, case-suffix. *Viz.* *Bāidaḥ* (*Bidānām apatyam māṇavakaḥ*), *Bāidāu*.

किमर्थमिदं ? नाचि इत्येवालुक् सिद्धः ?

What is the need for this? Is not the purpose achieved by the *sūtra Gōtrēslug aci* (4, 1, 89)?

अचि इत्युच्यते, न चात्र अजादिं पश्यामः

Aci is read and we do not see *ajādi* here.

प्रत्ययलक्षणेन By the dictum *Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam*.

वर्णाश्रये नास्ति प्रत्ययलक्षणम्

The dictum—*Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam* is not applicable with reference to the *kārya* of a single letter.

एकवचनद्विवचनान्तस्य प्रवृत्तौ बहुषु लोपो यूनि

Need to enjoin *lōpa* of *tadrāja* when the word is singular or dual and it is followed by *yuvapratyaya*.

एकवचनद्विवचनान्तस्य प्रवृत्तौ बहुषु लोपो यूनि वक्तव्यः - बैदस्य अपत्यं बहवो माणवकाः - बिदाः, बैदयोर्वा बिदाः ; अञ्यो बहुषु यञ्यो बहुषु इत्युच्यमानो लुङ् न प्राप्नोति

It must be said that *tadrāja* is dropped if the word ending in it is singular or dual and it is followed by *yuvapratyaya* followed by plural suffix. *Bidāḥ* (*Bāidasya apatyam bahavō māṇavakāḥ*), (*Bāidayōr apatyam bahavaḥ*). There is no chance for the elision of *añ* and *yañ* which take place when it is followed by *bahvarthatva*.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* reads: *Bidasya apatyāni bahūni iti añpratyayaḥ. Tadantād yūni Ata iñ iti iñ. Tasya Ṇyakṣatriyārṣa ñita iti luk.*

मा भूदेवम्, अञन्तं यद् बहुषु यञन्तं यद् बहुषु इत्येवं भविष्यति

Let it not take place in the above interpretation. It does take place if it is interpreted thus:—*añanta* or *yañanta* when followed by *bahvartha*.

नैवं शक्यम् । इह हि दोषः स्यात् - काश्यपप्रतिकृतयः काश्यपा इति

This is not possible. In that case there will be difficulty with reference to the form *Kāśyapāḥ* which means *Kāśyapapratikṛtayaḥ*.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* reads:—*Kaśyapasya apatyam gōtram iti bidāditvād añ. Tataḥ kāśyapa iva tatpratikṛtaya ityarthē Ivē pratikṛtāu iti kanpratyayaḥ. Tasya Jīvikārthē cāpaṇyē iti vā Dēvapathādiṣvarcāsu pūjanārthāsu citrakarmadhvajēṣu iti pāṭhād vā lup. Etad añantam bahuṣu vartatē iti luk-prasaṅgaḥ.*

ततोऽयमाह - यस्य प्रत्ययार्थबहुत्वे लुक्, द्वन्द्वेऽबहुषु लुग्वचनमित्यस्य परिहारः ।

Hence he said *Yasya pratyayārthabahutvē luk* as *parihāra* to *Dvandvēsbahuṣu lugvacanam.*

न वा सर्वेषां द्वन्द्वे बह्वर्थत्वात्

This need not be since all component parts in *dvandva* are associated with *bahvarthatva.*

न वैष दोषः This difficulty does not arise.

किं कारणम्? Why?

सर्वेषां द्वन्द्वे बह्वर्थत्वात् - सर्वाणि द्वन्द्वे बह्वर्थानि

On account of all component parts in *dvandva* being associated with *bahvarthatva.* All component parts in *dvandva* are associated with *bahvartha.*

कथम्? How?

युगपदधिकरणविवक्षायां द्वन्द्वो भवति

Dvandva takes place only when there is *vivakṣā* for the simultaneous *ēkādhikaraṇavṛttitva.*

ततोऽयमाह - यस्य बहुवचने परतो लुक्, यदि सर्वाणि द्वन्द्वे बह्वर्थानि अहमपीदमचोद्यं चोद्ये - द्वन्द्वेऽबहुषु लुग्वचनमिति, ममापि ह्यत्र सर्वत्र बहुवचनं परं भवति

Then says he who holds the *bahuvacanapratyayapakṣa.* "If all the component parts of *dvandva* are *bahvartha*, I too was found fault with where I should not be found fault with, since *bahuvacana* follows here in my opinion too".

लुकि कृते न प्राप्नोति There is no chance when there is *luk.*

प्रत्ययलक्षणेन भविष्यति

It will, from the dictum *Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam*.

न लुमता तास्मिन् इनि प्रत्ययलक्षणस्य प्रतिषेधः

There is *pratiṣēdha* to *pratyayalakṣaṇa* from the dictum '*Na lumatā tasmin*'.

न लुमताङ्गस्य इति वक्ष्यामि I shall read *Na lumatāṅgasya*

ननु चोक्तं नैवं शक्यम् इह हि दोष. स्य.त् - पञ्चभिः गार्गीभिः क्रीतः पटः पञ्चगार्ग्यो दशगार्ग्य इति ।

Oh, it was said that it is not possible to interpret it in that manner, since there will be difficulty here in securing the form *Pañcagārgyaḥ* whose *vigrahavākya* is *pañcabhiḥ gārgībhiḥ krītaḥ paṭaḥ* and *Daśagārgyaḥ*.

इष्टमेवैतत् सङ्गृहीतम् - पञ्चगर्गो दशगर्ग इत्येव भवितव्यम्

It was conceded that the forms might be *pañcagargaḥ* and *daśagargaḥ*.

तथेदमपरमचोद्यं चोद्ये - गर्गरूप्यं गर्गमयम् - अत्रापि बहुवचन इत्येव सिद्धम्

Similarly I was questioned with reference to *gargarūpyam* and *gargamayam*, which I do not deserve, since it is secured from the mention of *bahuvacanē*.

कथम् ? How ?

समर्थात्तद्धित उत्पद्यते । सामर्थ्यं च सुबन्तेन ।

Taddhitapratyaya makes its appearance after *samartha*. There is *sāmarthya* with *subanta*.

ततोऽयमाह यस्य प्रत्ययार्थबहुत्वे लुक्, यदि समर्थात्तद्धित उत्पद्यतेऽइमपीद- मचोद्यं चोद्ये 'गोत्रस्य बहुषु लोपिनो बहुवचनान्तस्य प्रवृत्तौ द्व्येकयोरलुक्' इति

Then says he who holds *bahuvacanapratyayārthapakṣa* that he need not be questioned with reference to *Gōtrasya bahuṣu lōpinō bahuvacanāntasya pravṛttāu dvyēkayōr aluk*.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* reads :- *Yō hi ubhayōr dōṣō na tam ēkaś cōdyaḥ*.

कथम्? How?

यस्यापि बहुवचने परतो लुक् तेनाप्यत्रालुग् वक्तव्यः । तस्यापि ह्यत्र बहुवचनं परं भवति

Aluk must be enjoined even by him who holds *bahuvacana-pratyayapakṣa,* since *bahuvacana* is here *para* even to him.

न वक्तव्यः, अचि इत्येवालुक् सिद्धः

No, it need not be enjoined. The object – *aluk* is achieved by the mention of *aci* (in the *sūtra Gōtrēslug aci* (4, 1, 89).

अचीत्युच्यते, न चात्राजादिं पश्यामः

There is mention of *aci*; but we do not see here *ajādi.*

प्रत्ययलक्षणेन

It is secured by the dictum *Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam,*

ननु चोक्तं वर्णाश्रये नास्ति प्रत्ययलक्षणम् इति

Oh, it was said that *Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam* does not operate when the *vidhi* relates to *varṇa.*

यदि वा कानि चिद्वर्णाश्रयाण्यपि प्रत्ययलक्षणेन भवन्ति तथेदमपि भविष्यति ।

If some *vidhis* relating to *varṇa* operate on the operation of the dictum *Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam,* this too follows them.

अथ वाविशेषेणालुकमुक्त्वा हलि न इति वक्ष्यामि

Or I shall read the *sūtra Hali na* after enjoining *aluk* as a general rule.

यद्यविशेषेणालुकमुक्त्वा हलि न इत्युच्यते, बिदानामपत्यं बहवो माणवकाः बिदाः, अत्राप्यलुक् प्राप्नोति

If *aluk* is enjoined as a general rule and then *Hali na* is read, there is chance for *aluk* in the word *Bidāḥ* meaning *Bidānām apatyam bahavō māṇavakāḥ.*

अस्तु । पुनरस्य युवबहुत्वे वर्तमानस्य लुग्भविष्यति

Let it be. *Luk,* afterwards, sets in there by the *sūtra Yañ-añōś ca* (2, 4, 64) which relates to *yuvabahutva.*

पुनरलुक्कस्मान्न भवति ? Why cannot *aluk* set in afterwards ?

समर्थानां प्रथमस्य गोत्रप्रत्ययान्तस्यालुगुच्यते, न चैतत् समर्थानां प्रथमं गोत्रप्रत्ययान्तम् ।

Aluk is enjoined to the first *gōtrapratyaya* which is *samartha* and this does not end in the *gōtrapratyaya* which is first among *samarthapratyayas*.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* reads:—*Prāthamakalpikē ca pratyayārthē vartamānasya prāthamyam. Yathā Gārgīyā iti. Atra yuvapratyayasya luki kṛtē yuvalakṣaṇam dvitīyam artham upasaṅkrāntōऽñantaḥ śabda iti prāthamyābhāvaḥ.*

किं तर्हि ? What then ?

द्वितीयमर्थमुपसङ्क्रान्तम् It has reference to *dvitīya-artha*.

अवश्यं चैतदेवं विज्ञेयम् - अत्रिभरद्वाजिका, वसिष्ठकश्यपिका, भृग्वङ्गिरसिका, कुत्सकुशिकिका इत्येवमर्थम् ।

This interpretation is necessary, so that the forms *Atri-bharadvājikā*, *Vasiṣṭha-Kaśyapikā*, *Bhṛgvaṅgirasikā* and *Kutsa-kuśikikā* may be secured.

गर्गभार्गविकाग्रहणं वा नियमार्थम्

Or the reading of *Gargabhārgavikā* is for *niyama*.

गर्गभार्गविकाग्रहणं वा क्रियते, तन्नियमार्थं भविष्यति, एतस्यैव द्वितीयमर्थमुपसङ्क्रान्तस्यालुग् भवति नान्यस्य इति

Or mention is made of *Garga-bhārvikā* and it will serve as *niyama*, that the *aluk* of the *pratyaya* which is *upasaṅkrānta* to the second *artha* takes place only here and nowhere else.

यदप्युच्यते - एकवचनद्विवचनान्तस्य प्रवृत्तौ बहुषु लोपो यूनि वक्तव्य इति, मा भूदेवम् - अङ्यो बहुषु यञ्यो बहुषु इति यञन्तं यद्बहुषु अञन्तं यद्बहुषु - इत्येवं भविष्यति

With reference to the statement *Ekavacana-dvivacanāntasya pravṛttāu bahuṣu lōpō yūni vaktavyaḥ*, it need not be taken

thus :- *añ yō bahuṣu, yañ yō bahuṣu.* but it may be taken thus :- *añantam yad bahuṣu, yañantam yad bahuṣu.*

ननु चोक्तम् नैवं शक्यम्; इह हि दोषः स्यात्, काश्यपप्रतिकृतयः काश्यपा इति

Oh! it was said that this is not possible, since, in that case, there will be difficulty with reference to the form *Kāśyapāḥ* meaning *Kāśyap pratikṛtayaḥ.*

नैष दोषः। लौकिकस्य तत्र गोत्रस्य ग्रहणं, न चैतद् लौकिकं गोत्रम्

This difficulty does not arise. That has reference to *lāukika-gōtra* and this is not *lāukika-gōtra.*

यस्य बहुवचने परतो लुक्, समासबहुत्वे तेन नेति प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः, तेनैव चेत् कृतं बहुत्वमिति वा वक्तव्यम्। यस्य प्रत्ययार्थबहुत्वे लुक् तेनास्त्रियामिति वक्तव्यम्। यस्य बहुवचने परतो लुक् तस्यायमधिको दोषः, अत्रय इति उदात्त-निवृत्तिस्वरः प्राप्नोति। तस्मात् प्रत्ययार्थबहुत्वे लुग् इत्येष पक्षो ज्यायान्।

By him who holds that *luk* takes place when plural suffix follows, either *samāsabahutvē pratiṣēdhaḥ* or *Tēnāiva cēt kṛtam bahutvam* has to be read; and by him who holds that *luk* takes place when *bahuvacanapratyayārtha* follows, *Astriyām* has to be read. There is this additional defect that the *udāttanivṛttisvara* will appear in *Atrayaḥ* in the *pratyaya-paratva-pakṣa.* Hence the *pakṣa pratyayārthabahutvē luk* is better,

अथ इह कथं भवितव्यम् - गार्गी च वात्स्यश्च वाज्यश्च इति? यदि तावदस्त्री विधिनाश्रीयते अस्त्यत्रास्त्रीति कृत्वा भवितव्यं लुका। अथ स्त्री प्रतिषेधेनाश्रीयते अस्त्यत्र स्त्रीति कृत्वा भवितव्यं प्रतिषेधेन।

What is to happen here in *Gārgī ca Vātsyaś ca Vājyaś ca?* If *astriyām* is taken to be *paryudāsa*, there is chance for *luk*, taking that there is *astrī* here and if it is taken as *prasajya-pratiṣēdha*, there is chance for *pratiṣēdha* taking that there is *strī* here.

किं पुनरत्रार्थसतत्त्वम् What is the truth here?

देवा एतद् ज्ञातुमर्हन्ति

It is only the learned men that have to decide.

अथ यो लोप्यलोपिनां समासस्तत्र कथं भवितव्यम्?

What should happen in the case of *samāsa* where some of whose component members allow *lōpa* and some do not?

उभयं हि दृश्यते - शरद्वच्छुनकदर्भाद् भृगुवत्साग्रायणेषु, नोदात्तस्वरितोदयमगार्ग्यकाश्यपगालवानाम् इति

Both are seen, as in *Śaradvac-chunakadarbhād bhṛguvatsāgrāyaṇēṣu* (4, 1, 102) and *Nōdattasvaritōdayam agārgyakāśyapa-gālavānām* (8, 4, 67).

Note :—*Kāiyaṭa* says there is *luk* in *bhṛgu* and *vatsa* of the former and it is absent in *gārgya* and *kāśyapa* of the latter.

यञञोश्च (12, 4, 64)

यञादीनामेकद्वयोर्वा तत्पुरुषे षष्ठ्या उपसङ्ख्यानम्

There is need to read *Yajñādīnām ēkadvayōr vā tatpuruṣē ṣaṣṭhyāḥ.*

यञादीनामेकद्वयोर्वा तत्पुरुषे षष्ठ्या उपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - गार्ग्यस्य कुलं गार्ग्यकुलं गर्गकुलं वा, गार्ग्ययोः कुलं गार्ग्यकुलं गर्गकुलं वा; वैदस्य कुलं वैदकुलं बिदकुलं वा; वैदयोः कुलं वैदकुलं बिदकुलं वा

There is need to enjoin *luk* with reference to *ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣa* also where the former member is *yañanta* or *añanta* and is singular or dual so that *Gārgyasya kulam* may compound into *Gārgyakulam* or *Gargakulam* and *Gārgyayōḥ kulam* may compound into *Gārgyakulam* or *Gargakulam*; *Bāidasya kulam* may compound into *Bāidakulam* or *Bidakulam* ann *Bāidayōḥ kulam* may compound into *Bāidakulam* or *Bidakulam.*

यञादीनामिति किमर्थम्?

Why is *Yañādīnām* read in the *vārttika*?

आङ्गस्य कुलम् आङ्गकुलम्, आङ्गयोः कुलम् आङ्गकुलम्

Since *Āṅgasya* and *kulam* compound into *āṅgakulam* and *Āṅgayōḥ* and *kulam* into *āṅgakulam.*

एकद्वयोरिति किमर्थम्? Why is *ēkadvayōḥ* read?

गर्गाणां कुलं गर्गकुलम्

So that *Gargāṇām* and *kulam* may compound into *Gargakulam.*

तत्पुरुष इति किमर्थम्? Why is *tatpuruṣē* read?

गार्ग्यस्य समीपम् उपगार्ग्यम्

So that *Gārgyasya* and *samīpam* may compound into *upagārgyam.*

षष्ठ्या इति किमर्थम्? Why is *ṣaṣṭhyāḥ* read?

शोभनगार्ग्यः, परमगार्ग्यः

There is no *luk* in the *prathamā-tatpuruṣa* like *śōbhanagārgyaḥ* and *paramagārgyaḥ.*

बह्वच इञः प्राच्यभरतेषु (2, 4, 66)

किमयं समुच्चयः प्राक्षु च भरतेषु च इति, आहोस्विद् भरतविशेषणं प्राग्ग्रहणं प्राञ्चो ये भरता इति?

Is *prācyabharatēṣu dvandvasamāsa* or *prathamā-tatpuruṣa-samāsa*?

किं चातः? What does it matter if it is either?

यदि समुच्चयो भरतग्रहणमनर्थकं, न ह्यन्यत्र भरताः सन्ति। अथ प्राग्ग्रहणं भरतविशेषणं, प्राग्ग्रहणमनर्थकं, न ह्यप्राञ्चो भरताः सन्ति।

If it is *dvandva, bharata* need not be read; for *Bharatas* are not found except in the east. If it is *prathamā-tatpuruṣa, prāk* is unnecessary: for there are no *bharatas* who do not live in eastern countries.

एवं तर्हि समुच्चयः If so, it is *dvandva.*

ननु चोक्तं भरतग्रहणमनर्थकं न ह्यन्यत्र भरताः सन्तीति

Oh, it was said that the word *bharata* then is unnecessary since *bharatas* are not found elsewhere.

नानर्थकम्; ज्ञापकार्थम्

It is not unnecessary; it is used to suggest something else.

किं ज्ञाप्यते? What is suggested?

एतद् ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो अन्यत्र प्राग्ग्रहणे भरतग्रहणं न भवति इति ।
Ācārya suggests that *prāk*, elsewhere, does not refer to *Bharatas*?

किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनम्?
What is the benefit of this *jñāpana*?

इञः प्राचाम्, भरतग्रहणं न भवति; औद्दालकिः पिता, औद्दालकायनः पुत्रः इति
Bharatas are not taken into account in the application of the *sūtra* *Iñaḥ prācām* (2, 4, 60) so that the father is *Āuddālakiḥ* and the son is *Āuddālakāyanaḥ* (and not *Āuddālakiḥ*).

न गोपवनादिभ्यः (2, 4, 67)

गोपवनादिप्रतिषेधः प्राग्घरितादिभ्यः
The *pratiṣēdha Na gōpavanādibhyaḥ* stops before *Haritādibhyōsñaḥ* (4, 1, 100).

गोपवनादिभ्यः प्रतिषेधः प्राग्घरितादिभ्यो द्रष्टव्यः हारितः, हारितौ; बहुषु हरिताः
The *pratiṣēdha* with reference to *Gōpavanādi* ceases to operate before the *sūtra Haritādibhyōsñaḥ* to secure *hāritaḥ* and *hāritāu* in the singular and the dual and *haritāḥ* in the plural.

उपकादिभ्योऽन्यतरस्यामद्वन्द्वे (2, 4, 69)

किमर्थमद्वन्द्व इत्युच्यते? Why is *advandvē* read?

द्वन्द्वे मा भूदिति To prevent the operation in *dvandva*.

नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम्, इष्यते एव द्वन्द्वे - भ्राष्ट्रककपिष्ठलाः, भ्राष्ट्रकिकापिष्ठलय इति
This is not the benefit. It is desired to operate in *dvandva*, as in *bhrāṣṭrakakapiṣṭhalāḥ* and *bhrāṣṭrakikāpiṣṭhalayaḥ*.

अत उत्तरं पठति He (*Vārttikakāra*, answers this:—

अद्वन्द्व इति द्वन्द्वाधिकारनिवृत्त्यर्थम्
Reading of *advandvē* is for the *nivṛtti* of *dvandvādhikāra*.

अद्वन्द्व इत्युच्यते । द्वन्द्वाधिकारनिवृत्त्यर्थम् - द्वन्द्वाधिकारो निवर्त्यते, तस्मिन्निवृत्तेऽविशेषेण द्वन्द्वे च अद्वन्द्वे च भविष्यति ।

Advandvē is read. For the sake of the *nivṛtti* of *dvandvādhikāra*. *Dvandvādhikāra* is made to recede. When it recedes, it operates both with reference to *dvandva* and *non-dvandva*.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* notes that *adhikāra* here does not refer to the technical one, but to that current in the world (i.e.) *apēkṣā-lakṣaṇa*.

आगस्त्यकौण्डिन्ययोरगस्तिकुण्डिनच् (2, 4, 70)

आगस्त्यकौण्डिन्ययोः प्रकृतिनिपातनम्

Need to read *prakṛtēḥ* in the *sūtra*.

आगस्त्यकौण्डिन्ययोः प्रकृतिनिपातनं कर्तव्यम् । अगस्तिकुण्डिनच् इत्येतौ प्रकृत्यादेशौ भवत इति वक्तव्यम्

There is need to read *prakṛtēḥ* in the *sūtra*. It must be read that *Agastya* and *Kuṇḍinac* are the *ādēśas* of the *prakṛti* alone.

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why?

लुक्प्रतिषेधे वृद्ध्यर्थम्

For the sake of *vṛddhi* at the *pratiṣēdha* of *luk*.

लुक्प्रतिषेधे वृद्धिर्यथा स्यात् To allow *vṛddhi* at *luk-pratiṣēdha*.

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* reads:—*Gōtrēslug aci iti luki pratiṣiddhē tatsanniyōgaśiṣṭasya ādēśasyāpi abhāva iti āgastyaśabdāt chaḥ siddhyati.*

प्रत्ययान्तनिपातने हि वृद्ध्यभावः

Absence of *vṛddhi* only if *ādēśa* is for *pratyayānta*.

प्रत्ययान्तनिपातने हि सति वृद्ध्यभावः स्यात्, आगस्तीयाः कौण्डिना इति; यदि प्रकृतिनिपातनं क्रियते केनेदानीं प्रत्ययस्य लोपो भविष्यति?

There will no *vṛddhi* only when the *ādēśa* replaces *pratyayānta*. Viz. *Āgastīyāḥ*, *Kāuṇḍināḥ*. If the *ādēśa* replaces *prakṛti* alone, which will effect the *pratyaya* to elide?

अधिकारात्प्रत्ययलोपः *Pratyayalōpa* is from *adhikāra.*

अधिकारात् प्रत्ययलोपो भविष्यति *Pratyaya* elides from *adhikāra.*

NOTE:—*Kāiyaṭa* says that there is *adhikāra* for *luk* and it elides.

तर्हि प्रकृतिनिपातनं कर्तव्यम्

If so, *prakṛtēḥ* must be read in the *sūtra.*

न कर्तव्यम्? No, it need not.

योगविभागात्सिद्धम्

The object is achieved through *sūtra-split.*

योगविभागः करिष्यते आगस्त्यकौण्डिन्ययोः - आगस्त्यकौण्डिन्ययोर्बहुषु लुग् भवति । ततः अगस्तिकुण्डिनच् - अगस्तिकुण्डिनच् इत्येतौ च प्रकृत्यादेशौ भवत आगस्त्यकौण्डिन्ययोरिति ।

The *sūtra* is split into two:—First *sūtra* is *Āgastya-Kāuṇḍinyayōḥ*, which means that there is *luk* when *Āgastya* and *Kāuṇḍinya* are followed by plural suffix. Then is the *sūtra Agastikuṇḍinac* read, which means that *Agasti* and *Kuṇḍinac* are the *ādēśas* of the *prakṛti* of *Āgastya* and *Kāuṇḍinya.*

एवमपि प्रत्ययान्तयोरेव प्राप्नोति । प्रत्ययान्ताद्धि भवान् षष्ठीमुच्चारयति आगस्त्यकौण्डिन्ययोरिति

Even then it may happen only to the *pratyayānta* in both. For you pronounce *ṣaṣṭhī* only after the *pratyayānta* in *Āgastya-kāuṇḍinyayōḥ.*

नैष दोषः । यथा परिभाषितं प्रत्ययस्य लुक्श्लुलुपो भवन्तीति प्रत्ययस्यैव भविष्यति, अवशिष्टस्यादेशौ भविष्यतः

This difficulty does not arise. There is *luk* only to the *pratyaya* since it is so read in *Pratyayasya lukślulupaḥ* and the *ādēśas* replace the parts which are left out.

यङोऽचि च (2, 4, 74)

ऊतोऽचि Need to read *ūtaḥ* qualifying *yaṅ.*

ऊतोऽचीति वक्तव्यम् - इह मा भूत् सनीस्रसो, दनीध्वस इति

Ūtaḥ must be read to qualify *yaṅ*, to prevent the elision of *yaṅ* in *sanīsrasaḥ* and *danīddhvasaḥ*.

अथ ऊत इत्युच्यमाने इह कस्मान्न भवति - योयूयः, रोरूयः

If *ūtaḥ* is read, which prevents the elision of *yaṅ* in *yōyūyaḥ* and *rōrūyaḥ*?

विहितविशेषणमूकारग्रहणम् - ऊकारान्ताद्यो विहित इति

Ūkāra is taken to be *vihitaviśēṣaṇa* in the sense, that which is enjoined after *ūkārānta*.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be read.

न वक्तव्यम् । इष्टमेवैतत्संगृहीतं, सनीस्रंसो दनीध्वंस इत्येव भवितव्यम् ।

No, it need not. The forms *sanīsraṁsaḥ* and *danīdhvaṁsaḥ* are the desired ones.

गातिस्थाघुपाभूभ्यः सिचः परस्मैपदेषु (2, 4, 77)

गापोर्ग्रहणे इण्पिबत्योर्ग्रहणम्

It must be read that *gā* and *pā* respectively refer to the roots *iṇ* and *pā* taking the *ādēśa pib*.

गापोर्ग्रहणे इण्पिबत्योर्ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । इणो यो गाशब्दः, पिबतेर्यः पाशब्द इति वक्तव्यम्; इह मा भूत् अगासीन्नटः, अपासीद्धनम् इति

It is necessary to read *iṇ-pibatyōḥ* qualifying *gāpōḥ* so that the elision of *sic* appears after *gā*, the *ādēśa* of *iṇ* and *pā*, which takes the *ādēśa pib* and not in *agāsīt* and *apāsīt* in *agāsīnnaṭaḥ* and *apāsīddhanam*.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must then be read.

न वक्तव्यम् । इणो ग्रहणे तावद्वार्त्तम्; निर्देशादेव व्यक्तं लुग्विकरणस्य ग्रहणमिति । पाग्रहणे चापि वार्त्तम्; उक्तमेतत् सर्वत्रैव पाग्रहणेऽलुग्विकरणग्रहणमिति ।

No, it need not be read. There is healthy sign that it refers to *iṇ* alone, since *gāti* clearly suggests that it belongs to the second conjugation. There is healthy sign that *pā* also refers

to that which takes the *ādēśa pib,* since it was noted that *pā* everywhere refers to that of the *alugvikaraṇa.*

तनादिभ्यस्तथासोः (3, 4, 79)

तथासोरात्मनेपदवचनम्

Need to read *ātmanēpada* as the adjunct of *ta* and *thās.*

तथासोरात्मनेपदस्य ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् - आत्मनेपदं यौ तथासाविति वक्तव्यम्

There is need to qualify of *tathāsōḥ* by *ātmanēpada. Ta* and *thās* must be stated to belong to *ātmanēpada.*

एकवचनग्रहणं वा

Or is the need to qualify them by *ēkavacana.*

अथ वा एकवचने ये तथासी इति वक्तव्यम्

Or it must be read that *ta* and *thās* which are singular are referred to here.

तच्चावश्यमन्यतरत् कर्तव्यम्

Hence it is absolutely necessary to read either.

अवचने ह्यनिष्टप्रसङ्गः

For it will land us in difficulties if it is not read.

अनुच्यमाने हि एतस्मिन्ननिष्टं प्रसज्येत - अतनिष्ट यूयम्, असनिष्ट यूयम् इति ।

If either is not read, there will be difficulty in arriving at the forms *atanișța yūyam* and *asanișța yūyam.*

तर्हि वक्तव्यम्? Is it then to be read ?

न वक्तव्यम । यद्यपि तावदयं तशब्दो दृष्टापचारः अस्ति आत्मनेपदम्, अस्त्येव परस्मैपदम्, अस्त्येकवचनम्, अस्ति बहुवचनम्, अयं तु खलु थास्शब्दोऽदृष्टापचार आत्मनेपदमेकवचनमेव च । तस्यास्य कोऽन्यः सहायो भवितुमर्हत्यन्यदत आत्मनेपदादेकवचनाच्च । तद्यथा - अस्य गोर्द्वितीयेनार्थ इति गौरेवानीयते नाश्वो न गर्दभ इति ।

No, it need not be read. Even though the range of *ta* is wide since it stands as both *ātmanēpada* and *parasmāipada,* termination and as singular and plural, the range of *thās* is restricted

to *ātmanēpada* and singular. Which deserves to be in association with it other than that which is *ātmanēpada* and singular? It is analogous to this:—If one says that he wants a second to a cow on hand, only a cow is fetched and not a horse nor an ass.

आमः (2, 4, 81)

आमो लेर्लोपे लुङ्लोटोरुपसङ्ख्यानम्

If there is *lōpa* for *li* after *ām*, there is need to add *luṅ* and *lōṭ*.

आमो लेर्लोपे लुङ्लोटोरुपसङ्ख्यानं कर्तव्यम् - तां वैजवापयो विदामक्रन्, अत्र भवन्तो विदाङ्कुर्वन्तु

If there is *lōpa* for *li* after *ām*, there is need to add *luṅ* and *lōṭ* (in the *sūtra Kṛñcānuprayujyatē liṭi* 3, 1, 40), so that the forms *vidām-akran*, *vidāṅ-kurvantu* in the expressions *Vāijavāpayō vidāmakran*, *Atra bhavantō vidāṅkurvantu* may be secured.

NOTE:—This arises on the understanding that there is *anuvṛtti* for *lēḥ* from the previous *sūtra Mantrē ghasa ...... janibhyō lēḥ* (2, 4, 80) & it refers to *liṭ*.

तर्हि वक्तव्यम् It must, then, be read.

न वक्तव्यम्; लिग्रहणं निवर्तिष्यते

It need not be read; *Lēḥ* is not taken here by *anuvṛtti*.

यदि निवर्तते प्रत्ययमात्रस्य लुक् प्राप्नोति

If, it recedes, there is chance for *luk* of any *pratyaya* that follows it.

इष्यत एव प्रत्ययमात्रस्य । आतश्चेष्यते, एवं ह्याह कृञ्चानुप्रयुज्यते लिटि इति

The *luk* of any *pratyaya* is desired for. It is desired from this fact also that *Ācārya* has read the *sūtra Kṛñcānuprayujyatē liṭi.*

यदि च प्रत्ययमात्रस्य लुग्भवति तत एतदुपपन्नं भवति

If the *luk* is allowed to any *pratyaya*, this may be considered to be free from defect.

आमन्तेभ्यो णलः प्रतिषेधः

There is need to prohibit the *luk* of *ṇal* after *āmanta*.

आमन्तेभ्यो णलः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - शशाम, तताम ; वृद्धौ कृतायामाम इति लुक् प्राप्नोति ।

There is need to prohibit the *luk* of *ṇal* after *āmantas*. For instance, after *vṛddhi* takes place in *śaśāma* and *tatāma*, *a* after *ām* may be dropped by the *sūtra Āmaḥ.*

आमन्तेभ्योऽर्थवद्ग्रहणाण्णलोऽप्रतिषेधः

There is no need to prohibit the *luk* of *ṇal* after *ām*, since the *sūtra Āmaḥ* is concerned with *ām* which has a meaning for itself.

आमन्तेभ्योऽर्थवद्ग्रहणाण्णलोऽप्रतिषेधः । अनर्थकः प्रतिषेधः अप्रतिषेधः

No purpose is served by enjoining the *pratiṣēdha* of *ṇal* after *āmanta*, since only the *ām* which has meaning is taken here into account.

लुक् कस्मान्न भवति शशाम, तताम इति ?

Why is there no room for *luk* in *śaśāma* and *tatāma* ?

अर्थवद्ग्रहणात् । अर्थवतः आम्शब्दस्य ग्रहणम्, न चैषोऽर्थवान्

Since *ām* which has meaning is taken here. *Ām* which has meaning is taken into account and *ām* in *śaśāma, tatāma* has no meaning for itself.

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *Ām pratyaya* is used in *svārtha*.

आमन्तेभ्योऽर्थवद्ग्रहणाण्णलोऽप्रतिषेध इति चेदमः प्रतिषेधः

If the *pratiṣēdha* of *luk* of *ṇal* after *āmanta* is unnecessary from *arthavadgrahaṇa*, there is need for the *pratiṣēdha* of *luk* of *ṇal* after the root *am*.

आमन्तेभ्योऽर्थवद्ग्रहणाण्णलोऽप्रतिषेध इति चेदमः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः - आम

If the *pratiṣēdha* of *luk* of *ṇal* after *āmanta* is unnecessary on account of *arthavadgrahaṇa*. the *pratiṣēdha* of *luk* of *ṇal* after the root *am* is needed for.

उक्तं वा. It has been answered.

किमुक्तम् ? How has it been answered ?

सन्निपातलक्षणो विधिरनिमित्तं तद्विघातस्य इति

The rule bringing out the combination of two things never destroys it.

NOTE:—Final *a* made the root *am* become *ām* and hence *ām* cannot destroy *ā*.

किं पुनर्लुग् आदेशानामपवादः, आहोस्वित् कृतेष्वादेशेषु भवति ?

Does *luk* operate before *lakāras* take their *ādēśas* or after it ?

लुगादेशापवादः *Luk* serves as the *apavāda* of *ādēśas*.

लुग् आदेशानामपवादः *Luk* serves as the *apavāda* of *ādēśas*.

तिङ्कृताभावस्तु If so, the *kārya* of *tiṅ* will be absent.

तिङ्कृतस्य तु अभावः Absence of the *kārya* of *tiṅ*.

कस्य ? Of which ?

पदत्वस्य Of *padatva*.

सुबन्तपदत्वात्सिद्धम् *Padatva* is secured through *subantatva*.

सुबन्तं पदमिति पदसंज्ञा भविष्यति

Padasaṁjñā is secured by *Subantam padam*.

कथं स्वाद्युत्पत्तिः ? How will *sup* appear there ?

लकारस्य कृत्त्वात् प्रातिपदिकत्वं तदाश्रयं प्रत्ययविधानम्

It is *prātipadika*, *lakāra* being *kṛt*. It gets *sup* on that basis.

लकारः कृत्; कृत्प्रातिपदिकमिति प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा, तदाश्रयं प्रत्ययविधानं प्रातिपदिकाश्रयत्वात् स्वाद्युत्पत्तिर्भविष्यति ।

Lakāra is *kṛt*; *lakārānta* gets *prātipadikasaṁjñā* by the *sūtra* *Kṛt-taddhita-samāsāś ca* (1, 2, 46). Appearance of *sup* depends upon *prātipadikatva*. *Sup*, having for its *āśraya* the *prātipadika*, appears.

यद्येवं, सुपः श्रवणं प्राप्नोति If so, *sup* may present itself.

अव्ययादिति लुग्भविष्यति

It disappears by *Avyayādāp supaḥ* (2, 4, 82.)

कथमव्ययत्वम् ? How does it get *avyaya-saṁjñā ?*

अव्ययत्वं मकारान्तत्वात्

It gets *avyayatva* on account of its ending in *m.*

कृदन्तं मान्तमव्ययसंज्ञं भवतीति अव्ययसंज्ञा भविष्यति

It gets *avyayasaṁjñā* since it is *kṛdanta* and *mānta* (by the *sūtra Kṛnmējantaḥ* 1, 1, 39)

स्वरः कथम् यत्प्रकारयाञ्चकार ?

On what basis does *pra* in *yatprakārayāñ cakāra* get its *svara* (*anudāttatva*) ?

NOTE :—*Kāiyaṭa* says that *pra* is *anudātta* by *Tiṅi Cōdāttavati* (8, 1, 71) when *tip* etc. is elided.

स्वरः कृदन्तप्रकृतिस्वरत्वात्

It gets its *svara* since *kṛdanta*, the following member of compound, takes its *prakṛtisvara.*

कृदन्तमुत्तरपदं प्रकृतिस्वरं भवतीत्येष स्वरो भविष्यति

The *svara* is secured on the strength of the statement *Kṛdantam uttarapadam prakṛtisvaram bhavati.*

तथा च निघातानिघातसिद्धिः

Hence are *nighātatva* and *anighātatva* secured.

तथा च निघातानिघातसिद्धिर्भवति - चक्षुष्कामं याजयांचकार - तिङ्ङतिङ इति तस्य चानिघातः, तस्माच्च निघातः सिद्धो भवति

Hence both *anighātatva* and *nighātatva* are secured, In *yājayāñcakāra* of the sentence *cakṣuṣkāmam yājayāñcakāra, ām,* being followed by *tiṅ* does not get *nighātatva* and *cakāra* gets it, since it is not followed by *tiṅ.*

नञा तु समासप्रसङ्गः

There is chance for it to compound with *nañ.*

नञा तु समासः प्राप्नोति - न कारयाम्, न हारयाम्; नञ् सुबन्तेन सह समस्यत इति समासः प्राप्नोति

There is chance for *āmanta* to compound itself with *nañ*, so that *na kārayām* and *na hārayām* may compound into *akārayām* and *ahārayām* on the strength of *Nañ subantēna saha samasyatē.*

उक्तं वा It has been answered.

किमुक्तम्? How has it been answered?

असामर्थ्यादिति - नात्र नञ आमन्तेन सामर्थ्यम्

On account of *asāmarthya.* There is no *sāmarthya* for *nañ* to compound itself with *āmanta*.

केन तर्हि? With what then?

लिङन्तेन - न चकार कारयाम्, न चकार हारयाम् इति

With *liḍanta* thus:-*Na cakāra kārayām, na cakāra hārayām.*

अव्ययादाप्सुपः (2, 4, 82)

अव्ययादापो लुग्वचनानर्थक्यं लिङ्गाभावात्

Injunction of *luk* of *āp* after *avyaya* is of no use on account of the absence of *liṅga.*

अव्ययादापो लुग्वचनमनर्थकम्

Injunction of *luk* of *āp* after *avyaya* is of no use.

किं कारणम्? Why?

लिङ्गाभावात् - अलिङ्गमव्ययम्

On account of the absence of *liṅga. Avyaya* denotes no gender.

किमिदं भवान् सुपो लुकं मृष्यत्यापो न मृष्यति, यथैव ह्यलिङ्गमव्ययम् एवमसङ्ख्यमपि?

How is it you tolerate the *luk* of *sup* and not that of *āp*? As *avyaya* does not denote gender, it does not denote number too.

सत्यमेवमेतत्। प्रत्ययलक्षणमाचार्यः प्रार्थयमानः सुपो लुकं मृष्यति, आपः पुनरस्य लुकि सति न किञ्चिदपि प्रयोजनमस्ति।

It is quite true. *Ācārya* tolerates the *luk* of *sup* since he wants to apply the principle *Pratyayalōpē pratyayalakṣaṇam*. No purpose is served by the *luk* of *āp*.

उच्यमानेऽप्येतस्मिन् स्वाद्युत्पत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति

Even though it is enjoined here, *sup* will not appear here,

किं कारणम् Why?

एकत्वादीनामभावात् । एकत्वादिष्वर्थेषु स्वादयो विधीयन्ते, न चैषामेकत्वादयः सन्ति ।

On account of the the absence of *ēkatva* etc. *Svādis* are enjoined when *ēkatva* etc. have to be denoted and *ēkatva* etc. have no chance to be associated with *avyaya*.

अविशेषेणोत्पद्यन्ते, उत्पन्नानां नियमः क्रियते

All the *sups* are enjoined together and then one of them is restricted.

अथ वा प्रकृतानर्थानपेक्ष्य नियमः क्रियते

Or *niyama* is enjoined with reference to the objects on hand.

के च प्रकृताः ? What are the objects on hand ?

एकत्वादयः । एकस्मिन्नेवैकवचनं न द्वयोर्न बहुषु । द्वयोरेव द्विवचनं नैकस्मिन्न बहुषु । बहुष्वेव बहुवचनं नैकस्मिन् न द्वयोरिति ।

Ēkatva etc. *Ekavacana* is used only to denote one and not two nor many; *dvivacana* is used only to denote two and not one nor many; and *bahuvacana* is used to denote many and not one nor two.

अथ वा आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति उत्पद्यन्तेऽव्ययेभ्यः स्वादय इति, यदयम् अव्ययादाप्सुप इति लुकं शास्ति ।

Or the procedure of *Ācārya* (*Sūtrakāra*) suggests that *su* etc. have a chance to appear ater *avyaya* since he enjoins *luk* of *sup* in the *sūtra Avyayādāp supaḥ*.

नाव्ययीभावादतोऽम्त्वपञ्चम्याः (2, 4, 83)

नाव्ययीभावादत इति योगव्यसानम्

Nāvyayībhāvād ataḥ should be taken as a separate *sūtra*.

नाऽव्ययीभावादतः इति योगः व्यवसेयः ; नाऽव्ययीभावाद् अकारान्तात् सुपो लुग् भवति ।

The *sūtra* should terminate in *ataḥ*, so that the first *sūtra* is *Nāvyayībhāvād ataḥ*, and it means that there is no *luk* to the *sup* which follows an *avyayībhāva* ending in *akāra*.

ततः अम्त्वपञ्चम्याः इति

Amtvapañcamyāḥ should then be taken separately.

किमर्थो योगविभागः ? What for is the *sūtra-split* ?

पञ्चम्या अम्प्रतिषेधार्थम्[1] To prohibit *am* replacing *pañcamī*.

पञ्चम्या अमः प्रतिषेधो यथा स्यात्

To prevent *am* from replacing *pañcamī*.

एकयोगे ह्युभयोः प्रतिषेधः

For there will be *pratiṣēdha* to both if it is taken as one *sūtra*.

एकयोगे ह्युभयोः प्रतिषेधः स्यात्, अमोऽलुकश्च

For, if it is one *sūtra*, both *am* and *aluk* will be prohibited.

स तर्हि योगविभागः कर्तव्यः

The *sūtra* has then to be split into two.

न कर्तव्यः No, it need not be split.

तुर्नियामकः The particle *tu* serves as *niyāmaká*.

तुः क्रियते, स नियामको भविष्यति, अमेवऽपञ्चम्याः

The particle *tu* is read and it serves as *niyāmaka* that *am* alone refers to *apañcamī*.

अमि पञ्चमीप्रतिषेधेऽपादानग्रहणम्

If *am* is prohibited to *pañcamī*, there is need to read *apādāna* as the *viśēṣaṇa* of *pañcamī*.

1. *Pratiṣēdhataḥ* is another reading.

अमि पञ्चमीप्रतिषेधेऽपादानग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् - अपादानपञ्चम्या इति वक्तव्यम्

If *am* is prohibited to *pañcamī*, *apādāna* should be read as the *viśēṣaṇa* thus – *apādānapañcamyāḥ*.

किं प्रयोजनम ? Why ?

कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्तेऽप्रतिषेधार्थम्

To avoid the *pratiṣēdha* to the *pañcamī* associated with *karmapravacanīya-pratyaya*.

कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्ते मा भूत् - आपाटलिपुत्रं वृष्टो देवः

To avoid the *pratiṣēdha* to that which is associated with *karmapravacanīya*. *Viz. Ā-pāṭaliputram vṛṣṭō dēvaḥ*.

न वोत्तरपदस्य कर्मप्रवचनीययोगात्समासात्पञ्चम्यभावः

No, it need not be read. Only the second member of the compound is associated with *karmapravacanīya* and not the compound and hence there is no chance for *pañcamī*.

न वा वक्तव्यम् It need not be read.

किं कारणम् ? Why ?

उत्तरपदमत्र कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्तम् । उत्तरपदस्य कर्मप्रवचनीययोगात् समासात् पञ्चमी न भविष्यति । यदा च समासः कर्मप्रवचनीययुक्तो, भवति तदा पञ्चमीप्रतिषेधः तद्यथा आ उपकुम्भात्, आ उपमणिकाद् इति ।

The second member of the compound is here associated with *karmapravacanīya*. Since the *uttarapada* has *yōga* with *karmapravacanīya*, there is no chance for *pañcamī* after the *samāsa*. If the *samāsa* is, on the other hand, associated with *karmapravacanīya*, there will be *pratiṣēdha* for *pañcamī*. *Viz. Ā upakumbhāt* and *ā upamaṇikāt*.

तृतीयासप्तम्योर्बहुलम् (2, 4, 84)

सप्तम्या ऋद्धिनदीसमाससङ्ख्यावयवेभ्यो नित्यम्

Replacing of *saptamī* by *am* is *nitya* with reference to *ṛddhi*, *nadīsamāsa* and *saṅkhyāvayava*.

सप्तम्या ऋद्धिनदीसमाससङ्ख्यावयवेभ्यो नित्यमिति वक्तव्यम् - ऋद्धि - सुमद्रं, सुमगधम्; नदीसमास - उन्मत्तगङ्गं, लोहितगङ्गम्; सङ्ख्यावयव - एकविंशतिभारद्वाजं, त्रिपञ्चाशद्गौतमम् ।

It must be stated that the replacing of *saptamī* by *am* is *nitya* with reference to *ṛddhi, nadīsamāsa* and *saṅkhyāvayava. Viz. Ṛddhi – Sumadram, sumagadham ; nadī-samasa - unmatta-gaṅgam, lōhitagaṅgam ; saṅkhyāvayava - Ēkaviṁśatibhāradvājam tripañcāśadgāutamam.*

लुटः प्रथमस्य डारौरसः (2, 4, 85)

There are *two* topics dealt with here :– (1) Is it necessary to state that *ḍā, rāu,* and *ras* replace *ta, ātām, jha* in *luṭ* by *pūrvavipratiṣēdha* or by reading *ātmanēpadānāñ ca?* (2) Is it necessary for *śitkaraṇa* in *ḍāvikāra?*

I

टितां टेरोर्विधेर्लुटो डारौरसः पूर्वविप्रतिषिद्धम्

Need to state that *ḍā, rāu* and *ras* replace *tē, itē, antē* secured by the *sūtra Ṭita ātmanēpadānām ṭērē* (3, 4, 79) by *pūrva-vipratiṣēdha.*

टितां टेरोर्विधेर्लुटो डारौरसो भवन्ति पूर्वविप्रतिषेधेन । टेरेत्वस्यावकाशः - पचते पचेते पचन्ते । डारौरसामवकाशः, श्वः कर्ता, श्वः कर्तारौ, श्वः कर्तारः । इहोभयं प्राप्नोति - श्वोऽध्येता, श्वोऽध्येतारौ, श्वोऽध्येतारः इति - डारौरसो भवन्ति पूर्वविप्रतिषेधेन ।

Ḍārāurasāḥ operates in preference to *Ṭita ātmanēpadānāṁ ṭērē* (3, 4, 79) by *pūrvavipratiṣēdha.* The *sūtra Ṭita ... ṭērē* operates with reference to *pacatē, pacētē* and *pacantē, Dārāurasaḥ* operates with reference to *kartā (śvaḥ), kartārāu (śvaḥ)* and *kartāraḥ (śva).* Here in *adhyētā (śvaḥ), adhyētārāu (śvaḥ)* and *adhyētāraḥ (śvaḥ),* both have room to operate and *ḍrāurasaḥ* operates by *pūrvavipratiṣēdha.*

स तर्हि पूर्वविप्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः

Pūrvavipratiṣēdha is, then, to be enjoined.

न वक्तव्यः No, it need not be enjoined.

आत्मनेपदानां चेति वचनात्सिद्धम्
It is accomplished by reading *Ātmanēpadānāñ ca.*

आत्मनेपदानां च डारौरसो भवन्तीति वक्तव्यम्
It must bé read that *Ḍā, rāu* and *ras* replace *ātmanēpada* terminations also.

तच्च समसङ्ख्यार्थम्
It is for the sake of the same number in *sthānin* and in *ādēśa,*

तच्चावश्यमात्मनेपदग्रहणं कर्तव्यं समसङ्ख्यार्थम्, सङ्ख्यातानुदेशो यथा स्यात् । अक्रियमाणे ह्यात्मनेपदग्रहणे षट् स्थानिनः त्रय आदेशाः । वैषम्यात् सङ्ख्यातानुदेशो न प्राप्नोति ।

Ātmanēpadānāñ ca must necessarily be read for the sake of having the same number both in *sthānin* and in *ādēśa,* so that one may replace another respectively. If *ātmanē-padānāñ ca* is not read, there will be six *sthānins* and there *ādēśas.* Since they are not of the same number, it is not possible for *ādēśas* to replace *sthānins* in the order in which they are read.

पूर्वविप्रतिषेधार्थेन तावन्नार्थ आत्मनेपदग्रहणेन
It is not necessary that *ātmanēpadānāñ ca* should be read to serve the purpose of *pūrvavipratiṣēdha.*

इदमिह सम्प्रधार्यम् - डारौरसः क्रियन्तां टेरेत्वमिति
This is here to be determined whether *ḍā, rāu* and *ras* appear first or *tē, itē* and *antē.*

किमत्र कर्तव्यम् ? Which should be given precedence ?

परत्वादेत्वम् *Etv m,* being *para,* is to be given precedence.

नित्या डारौरसः । कृतेऽप्येत्वे प्राप्नुवन्त्यकृतेऽपि प्राप्नुवन्ति
Ḍā, rāu and *ras* are *nitya* and they can appear both before *ētva* appears and after it.

टेरेत्वमपि नित्यं, कृतेष्वपि डारौरस्सु प्राप्नोति अकृतेष्वपि प्राप्नोति ।

Etva to *ṭi* also is *nitya;* for it can appear both before *ḍā, rāu* and *ras* appear and after them.

अनित्यमेत्वम् । अन्यस्य कृतेषु डारौरस्सु प्राप्नोति, अन्यस्य अकृतेषु प्राप्नोति । शब्दान्तरस्य प्राप्नुवन्विधिरनित्यो भवति ।

Etva is *anitya* since it has a chance to appear in one place where *ḍā, rāu* and *ras* have appeared and in another place where they have not. The *vidhi* which operates in one place and which does not operate in another place is *anitya.*

डारौरसोऽप्यनित्याः, अन्यस्य कृते एत्वे प्राप्नुवन्ति अन्यस्य अकृते । शब्दान्तरस्य च प्राप्नुवन्तोऽनित्या भवन्ति ।

Ḍā, rāu and *ras* too are *anitya,* since they appear both where *ētva* has already set in and where *ētva* has not set in. The *vidhis* which operate in one place and which do not operate in another are *anitya.*

उभयोरनित्ययोः परत्वादेत्वम् । एत्वे कृते पुनःप्रसङ्गविज्ञानाद् डारौरसो भविष्यन्ति ।

Since both are *anitya, ētva,* being *para,* operates. After *ētva* has appeared, *ḍā, rāu* and *ras* appear through *punaḥprasaṅga-vijñāna.*

समसङ्ख्यार्थेन चापि नार्थ आत्मनेपदग्रहणेन । स्थानेऽन्तरतमेन व्यवस्था भविष्यति ।

There is no need to read *Ātmanēpadānāñ ca* for the sake of *samasaṅkhyā.* The correct *ādēśa* is decided on the dictum *Sthānēsntaratamaḥ.*

कुतः आन्तर्यम् ?

From which aspect is similarity to be reckoned ?

अर्थतः । एकार्थस्यैकार्थः, द्व्यर्थस्य द्व्यर्थः, बह्वर्थस्य बह्वर्थः

Through meaning. Singular replaces the singular, dual, the dual and plural, the plural.

अथ वा आदेशा अपि षडेव निर्दिश्यन्ते

Or the *ādēśas* too read here are six.

कथम्? How?

एकशेषनिर्देशात् । एकशेषनिर्देशोऽयम्

Since it is taken to be *ēkaśēṣa*. This is read in *ēkaśēṣa* form.

अथैतास्मिन्नेकशेषनिर्देशे सति किमयं कृतैकशेषाणां द्वन्द्वो डा च डा च डा, रौ च रौ च रौ, रश्च रश्च रः, डा च रौ च रश्च डारौरस इति, आहोस्वित् कृतद्वन्द्वानामेकशेषः, डा च रौ च रश्च डारौरसः, डारौरसश्च डारौरसश्च डारौरस इति?

Is *ḍārāurasaḥ* the *dvandva* of *ēkaśēṣa* formed thus:- *ḍā ca ḍā ca ḍā, rāu ca rāu ca rāu, raś ca raś ca raḥ, ḍā ca rāu ca raś ca ḍārāurasaḥ* or the *ēkaśēṣa* of the *dvandva* formed thus- *ḍā ca rāu ca raś ca ḍārāurasaḥ, ḍārāurasaś ca ḍārāurasaś ca ḍārau-rasaḥ*?

किं चातः? What is the difference if it is either?

यदि कृतैकशेषाणां द्वन्द्वः, अनिष्टः समसङ्ख्यः प्राप्नोति । एकवचनद्विवचनयोर्डा प्राप्नोति, बहुवचनैकवचनयो रौ प्राप्नोति, द्विवचनबहुवचनयोश्च रस् प्राप्नोति । अथ कृतद्वन्द्वानामेकशेषः, न दोषो भवति ।

If *dvandva* follows *ēkaśēṣa*, there is chance for undesirable *samasaṅkhyā* thus:-*ḍā* will replace singular and dual termination, *rāu* plural and singular termination and *ras*, dual and plural termination. If *ēkaśēṣa* follows *dvandva*, there will be no defect.

यथा न दोषस्तथास्तु

Let it be taken in the way which is unquestionable.

किं पुनरत्र ज्यायः? Which is better here?

उभयमित्याह । उभयं हि दृश्यते, बहु शक्तिकिटकं, बहूनि शक्तिकिटकानि; बहु स्थालीपिठरं, बहूनि स्थालीपिठराणि!

Both, says he. For both are current:-*Bahu śaktikiṭakam* and *bahūni śaktikiṭakāni; bahu sthālīpiṭharam* and *bahūni sthālī-piṭharāṇi*.

अथवा आन्तर्यतो व्यवस्था भविष्यति । आन्तर्याद् एकार्थस्यैकार्थः, द्व्यर्थस्य द्व्यर्थः, बह्वर्थस्य बह्वर्थ इति ।

Or the decision can be made through their similarity — singular in place of singular, dual in place of dual and plural in place of plural.

डारौरसः कृते टेरे यथा द्वित्वं प्रसारणे ।
समसङ्ख्येन नार्थोऽस्ति सिद्धं स्थानेऽर्थतोऽन्तरः ॥

आन्तर्यतो व्यवस्था त्रय एवेमे भवन्तु सर्वेषाम् ।
टेरेत्वं च परत्वात्कृतेऽपि तस्मिन्निमे सन्तु ॥

The above two *ślōkavārttikas* contain the ideas already dealt with and perhaps belong to another *Vārttikakāra*.

II

डाविकारस्य शित्करणं सर्वादेशार्थम्

Need to read the *ādēśa ḍā* as *ḍāś* for *sarvādēśa*.

डाविकारः शित् कर्तव्यः

The *ādēśa ḍā* should be read with *ś* as *it*.

किं प्रयोजनम्? Why?

सर्वादेशार्थम् - शित्सर्वस्य इति सर्वादेशो यथा स्यात् । अक्रियमाणे हि शकारे अलोन्त्यस्य विधयो भवन्तीति अन्त्यस्य प्रसज्येत ।

For the sake of *sarvādēśa*. So that it may replace the whole by "... *śit sarvasya*" (1, 1, 55). Otherwise, it will replace only the final letter by *Alōntyasya*.

निघातप्रसङ्गस्तु There is chance for *nighāta* too.

निघातस्तु प्राप्नोति । श्वः कर्ता, तासेः परं लसार्वधातुकम् अनुदात्तं भवतीत्येष स्वरः प्राप्नोति ।

It may take *anudātta-svara*. *Ā* in *kartā* of *śvaḥ kartā* will become *anudātta* by *Tasyānudāttēt ... lasārvadhātukam anudāttam* ... (6, 1, 186).

यत्तावदुच्यते डाविकारस्य शित्करणं सर्वादेशार्थमिति

Firstly with reference to the statement *Ḍāvikārasya śitkaraṇam sarvādēśārtham*.

सिद्धमलोऽन्त्यविकारात्
The object is achieved even if the *ādēśa* replaces the *antya*.

सिद्धमेतत् This is accomplished.

कथम्? How?

अलोऽन्त्यविकारात् । अस्त्वयमलोऽन्त्यस्य
By the *ādēśa* replacing the final letter. Let the *ādēśa* replace the final letter.

का रूपसिद्धिः ? What is the form secured?

कर्ता *Kartā*.

डिति टेर्लोपाल्लोपः *Ta* may be elided since *ṭi* elides before *ḍit*.

डिति टेर्लोपेन लोपो भविष्यति
Lōpa of *ta* may take place on account of the elision of *ṭi* before *ḍit*.

अभत्वान्न प्राप्नोति
The *sūtra* *Ṭēḥ* (6, 4, 143) does not operate since the stem is not *bha*.

डित्करणसामर्थ्याद् भविष्यति
It (the *lōpa* of *ṭi*) takes place on account of the *sāmarthya* of *ḍitkaraṇa*.

अनित्त्वाद्वा Or on account of its not getting the designation *it*.

अथ वा अनित्त्वाद् एतत् सिद्धम्
Or this is accomplished on account of its not getting the designation *it*.

किमिदमनित्त्वादिति ? What is conveyed by *anitvāt*?

अन्त्यस्य अयं स्थाने भवन्न प्रत्ययः स्यात्; असत्यां प्रत्ययसंज्ञायामित्संज्ञा न; असत्यामित्संज्ञायां लोपो न, असति लोपे, अनेकाल्; यदा अनेकाल् तदा सर्वादेशः; यदा सर्वादेशः, तदा प्रत्ययः; यदा प्रत्ययः, तदा इत्संज्ञा यदा इत्संज्ञा; तदा लोपः ।

That which replaces the final of a *pratyaya* cannot itself be a *pratyaya*; if it is not a *pratyaya*, there is no chance for *it-saṁjñā*; in the absence of *it-saṁjñā*, there is no elision; it is *anēkāl*, if there is no elision; there is *sarvādēśa* on its being *anēkāl*; it gets the designation *pratyaya*, when there is *sarvādēśa*; it gets *itsaṁjñā*, as soon as it gets the designation *pratyaya*; there is *lōpa* on its getting *itsaṁjñā*.

प्रश्लिष्टनिर्देशाद्वा Or by taking it to be *praśliṣṭa-nirdēśa*.

अथ वा प्रश्लिष्टनिर्देशोऽयम्, डा आ डा । सः अनेकाल् शित्सर्वस्य इति सर्वादेशो भविष्यति । यदा तर्हि अयमन्त्यस्य स्थाने भवति तदा तिङ्ग्रहणेन ग्रहणं न प्राप्नोति ।

Or this is *praśliṣṭanirdēśa* (i.e.) *ḍā* stands for *ḍā ā*. It serves as *sarvādēśa* on the strength of the *sūtra Anēkāl śit sarvasya*. If it appears, on the other hand, in place of *antya*, it cannot be called *tiṅ*.

तिङ्ग्रहणमेकदेशविकृतस्यानन्यत्वात्

It gets the designation *tiṅ* on the dictum *Ekadēśavikṛtam ananyavad bhavati*.

एकदेशविकृतमनन्यवद्भवतीति तिङ्ग्रहणेन ग्रहणं भविष्यति ।

It gets the designation *tiṅ* on the dictum *Ekadēśavikṛtam ananyavad bhavati*.

स्वरः कथम्? How is the proper *svara* secured?

स्वरे विप्रतिषेधात् सिद्धम्

The proper *svara* is secured through *vipratiṣēdha*.

इदमिह सम्प्रधार्यम् - डारौरसः क्रियन्ताम्, अनुदात्तत्वम् इति

This has to be decided whether the *ādēśas ḍā*, *rāu* and *ras* precede the *anudāttatva* of *tip* or succeed.

किमत्र कर्तव्यम्? What is to be done here?

परत्वादनुदात्तत्वम्. *Anudāttatva*, being *para*, should precede it.

नित्या डारौरसः, कृतेऽप्यनुदात्तत्वे प्राप्नुवन्त्यकृतेऽपि प्राप्नुवन्ति
Ḍā, *rāu* and *ras* are *nitya*, since they appear whether *anudāttatva* has set in or no.

अनुदात्तत्वमपि नित्यं, कृतेष्वपि डारौरस्सु प्राप्नोति, अकृतेष्वपि प्राप्नोति ।
Anudāttatva, too, is *nitya*, since it chances to appear both before *ḍā*, *rāu* and *ras* set in and after they have set in.

अनित्यमनुदात्तत्वम् ; अन्यस्य कृतेषु डारौरस्सु प्राप्नोति, अन्यस्याकृतेषु ; शब्दान्तरस्य च प्राप्नुवन्विधिरनित्यो भवति ।
Anudāttatva is *anitya*. It has a chance to operate both when *ḍā*, *rāu* and *ras* make their appearance in others or not. The dictum is *Śabdāntarasya ca prāpnuvan vidhir anityō bhavati.*

डारौरसोऽप्यनित्याः; अन्यथास्वरस्य कृतेऽनुदात्तत्वे प्राप्नुवन्ति, अन्यथा स्वरस्य अकृते । स्वरभिन्नस्य च प्राप्नुवन्तोऽनित्या भवन्ति ।
Ḍā, *rāu* and *ras* too are *anityas*. They operate both when *anudāttatva* replaces one *svara* and it does not do so. Those that operate with reference to different *svaras* are *anityas*.

उभयोरप्यनित्ययोः परत्वादनुदात्तत्वम् । अनुदात्तत्वे कृते पुनःप्रसङ्गविज्ञानाड्डारौरासः ।
Both being *anitya*, *anudāttatva* sets in, being *para*. After *anudātta* appears, *ḍā*, *rāu* and *ras* make their appearance by *punaḥ-prasaṅga-vijñāna*.

टिलोपे उदात्तनिवृत्तिस्वरेण सिद्धम्
At the elision of the final syllable, it is achieved by *udātta-nivṛttisvara*.

न सिध्यति It is not achieved.

किं कारणम् ? Why?

अन्तरङ्गत्वाड्डारौरसः
Ḍā, *rāu* and *ras* operate first, they being *antaraṅga*.

तत्रान्तरङ्गत्वाड्डारौरस्सु कृतेष्वनुदात्तत्वं क्रियतां टिलोप इति ।

After *Dā*, *rāu* and *ras* operate being *antaraṅga*, which appears earlier, *anudāttatva* or *ṭilōpa*?

किमत्र कर्तव्यम्? What is to be done here?

परत्वाट्टिलोपेन भवितव्यम् *Ṭilōpa* is to precede, since it is *para*.

एवं तर्हि स्वरविप्रतिषेधात्सिद्धम् । न्याय्य एवायं स्वरे विप्रतिषेधः

If so, the object is achieved by *svara-vipratiṣēdha*. It is but legitimate to have *vipratiṣēdha* with reference to *svara*.

इदमिह सम्प्रधार्यम् - अनुदात्तत्वं क्रियताम्, उदात्तनिवृत्तिस्वर इति

This has to be decided whether *anudāttatva* is to precede *udāttanivṛttisvara*.

किमत्र कर्तव्यम्? What is to be done here?

परत्वादनुदात्तत्वम्

Anudāttatva should precede, it being *para*.

अनुदात्तत्वे कृते पुनःप्रसङ्गविज्ञानाद् उदात्तनिवृत्तिस्वरो भविष्यति ।

After *Anudāttatva* operates, *udāttanivṛttisvara* may set in by *punaḥprasaṅgavijñāna*.

तदेतत् क्व सिद्धं भवति? Where will this be achieved?

यत् पिद्वचनम् Where it is read *pit*.

यदपिद्वचनं तत्र न सिध्यति?

Is it not achieved where it is not read *pit*?

तत्रापि सिद्धम् It is achieved there too.

कथम्? How?

इदमद्य लसार्वधातुकानुदात्तत्वं प्रत्ययस्वरस्यापवादः । न चापवादविषये उत्सर्गोऽभिनिविशते । पूर्वं ह्यपवादा अभिनिविशन्ते पश्चादुत्सर्गाः, प्रकल्प्य वापवादविषयं तत उत्सर्गोऽभिनिविशते ।

The *sūtra Tāsyanudāttēn ... lasārvadhātukam anudāttam aṅhviṅōḥ* (6, 1, 186) enjoining *anudāttatva* to *ḍā* etc. is the *apavāda* to the *sūtra Ādyudāttaś ca* (3, 1, 3) enjoining *anudāttatva* to the *pratyaya*. *Utsarga* does not operate where the *apavāda* is to operate. First do *apavādas* operate and then only do *utsargas*. Or *utsarga* operates after reserving room for *apavāda*.

तत्र तावदत्र कदाचित् प्रत्ययस्वरो भवति अपवादं लसार्वधातुकानुदात्तत्वं प्रतीक्षते । तत्रानुदात्तत्वं क्रियतां लोप इति, यद्यपि परत्वाल्लोपः, सोऽसावविद्यमानोदात्तत्वे अनुदात्ते उदात्तो लुप्यते ।

Pratyayasvara does never set in and expects the *apavāda lasārvadhātukānudāttatva* to operate. The question arises whether *anudāttatva* is to operate or *lōpa*. Even though there is chance for *lōpa*, it being *para*, the *udātta* elides giving room to *anudāttatva* secured by the absence of *udāttatva*.

प्रत्ययस्वरापवादो लसार्वधातुकानुदात्तत्वम् ।
तेन तत्र न प्रसक्तः प्रत्ययस्वरः कदाचित् ॥
प्रत्ययस्वरश्च तासेर्वृत्तिसंनियोगशिष्टः ।
तेन चाप्यसावुदात्तो लोप्स्यते तथा न दोषः ॥

The above are the two *ślōkavārttikas* containing the ideas mentioned above.

Āhnika Twentyeight ends.

(Second *adhyāya*, fourth *pāda*, second *Āhnika* ends)

Volume VI ends.



CORRIGENDA

Page	Line	For	Read
32	27,30	*anya-pradhana*	*avyaya-pradhāna*
49	24	manses	menses
129	30	।सद्धम्	सिद्धम्
168	27	यथ	यथा
177	24	चाक्षिङः	चक्षिङः
178	19,22	*bhārvikā*	*bhārgavikā*
193	23	आचाय-	आचार्य-
207	25		

i. INDEX OF SŪTRAS

(Number refers to page)

ii. INDEX OF VĀRTTIKAS

---

iii. INDEX OF PARIBHĀṢĀS etc.

INDEX OF IMPORTANT SANSKRIT WORDS

---

iii. INDEX OF PARIBHĀṢĀS etc.

---

iv. INDEX OF IMPORTANT SANSKRIT WORDS

INDEX OF IMPORTANT SANSKRIT WORDS